

All over this country exciting and significant breakthroughs are being made in data processing and information retrieval.

Our hope, contained in H.R. 664, is to create a national system which would make funds available to these individual efforts and then, under their own auspices, management, and direction, tie them in to the national information system.

I sincerely believe we are on the threshold of one of the most exciting and daring achievements in the history of civilization. When man has devised a system for quick exchange of the products of his ingenious mind, only then will we be able to solve the many problems which have plagued civilization since its beginning.

Finally, gentlemen, what we propose here today can indeed help pave the way for mankind to solve his most pressing problem—that of conflict between nations.

The United States has been seeking ways to capture the imagination of people throughout the world, and through our various programs to convince them that indeed their future promises greater hope by aligning themselves with our concepts.

We have succeeded in some areas and failed in others.

A national information system can have a profound effect on this Nation's foreign policy and help chart the way toward better understanding among nations—particularly

among the newly emerging nations of the world.

I need only recall for you the impassioned plea made by some 2,300 scientists and scholars from the newly emerging nations of the world who met in Geneva 2 years ago, and in a formal resolution called upon the free world to establish a system by which they could share in the exchange of scientific knowledge for their own countries.

Man has made nuclear war so costly that we have reason to hope it can be avoided.

Our battlelines now are in the field of ideas; in the field of knowledge; in the field of concepts and philosophy.

Imagine, if you can, what a fantastic weapon for peace and freedom the United States would acquire if it had a National Information System now which it could make readily available to the scientists of the whole world to use as they wish. Here, I submit, is the lasting road to peace and dignity among men. Dr. Jerome Welsner, President Kennedy's science adviser, quite properly observed that, "The balance of power between nations may well be resolved in favor of that country which has the most effective information retrieval system."

And so you see, gentlemen, the challenge before us is breathtaking. Through hard work and unselfish support, we can build a National Information System which will not

only strengthen our own democracy, but will prove one of our most formidable weapons in the struggle for peace.

My plea to the cynics and the skeptics is, "Don't fail to see the forest for the trees." We are not talking about centralization. We are not talking about the Government taking over the whole operation. We are not talking about reducing or eliminating existing facilities.

Indeed, it would be my hope that we could devise a method by which a national information system could be operated within the concept of Comsat, a private corporation created by Congress with strong support from the Federal Government, and this may also come. But for now we need a start, and I submit that H.R. 664 is the vehicle by which we can give everything said here today living meaning.

You will recall President Kennedy so eloquently reminded us that even a journey of 1,000 miles requires a first step. President Johnson, in every single program which he has presented to Congress, has recognized that ancient Chinese proverb.

I urge you to join me in supporting this first step embodied in H.R. 664.

May I conclude by reminding you that the true meaning of democracy is that whatever sacrifice we must make for our freedom to endure, we shall endure it freely.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, APRIL 29, 1965

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rev. Harry E. Olson, Jr., pastor, Messiah Lutheran Church, Fargo, N. Dak., offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

Almighty God, the eyes of all wait upon Thee in this moment of silence and prayer. Empower these chosen men and women with evidence of the spirit of God within them. Help us to remember that this place is not an island unto itself but a part of the mainland. It is within these walls that we must remember the needs of all men. To that end enable those in positions of responsibility with such a sense of duty that no self-interest shall turn them from it. May we full well realize this day, O Lord, that history is being made by our judgments and the destiny of men's lives charted by our decisions. Grant Thy mighty aid to the efforts of men to establish peace among the nations of the world, through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

THE PRESIDENT'S ACTION IN THE DOMINICAN REPUBLIC

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I am sure the American people and the Congress

will not only support strongly but appreciate the action taken by the President of the United States in dispatching troops to the Dominican Republic for the purpose of safely evacuating American civilians and other foreign nationals. The President had no alternative under the circumstances.

The President had made urgent appeals to both sides in this struggle to cease fire long enough to permit the removal of civilians from the area. His petitions were ignored. Those in charge of the law-enforcement agencies of the Dominican Republic had notified American officials that it would no longer be possible for either civilian or military personnel on the ground to protect American citizens.

Under the circumstances the action of the President of the United States was not only correct; it was absolutely necessary. Marines were used in a protective evacuation and up to this time have not engaged in any shooting incidents.

The President has been joined in his appeal for an immediate cease fire by the Organization of American States which will present a formal request at an open meeting of the OAS later today.

I understand that the French Republic also has taken steps to protect the lives of its citizens in the Dominican Republic by sending in two warships for evacuation purposes.

THE SITUATION IN THE DOMINICAN REPUBLIC

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I want to supplement and ap-

prove what the majority leader has said concerning the Dominican Republic. It has been established beyond the peradventure of a doubt that while that which the commentators have referred to as a local and internal conflict which started with the best intentions in the world to keep it a local affair, it has been documented that those now in charge have been oriented, trained, and directly identified with Castro's Cuba and that they are Communists. There is no question about this. It has been established.

The Americans in that part of the world were in grave danger. The local government could not cope with this type of warfare. The people in charge of this activity have been trained to conduct this type of guerrilla warfare and the government was unable, even with the implements in their possession, to control it.

It has also been established that those who started this and who had good intentions, have repudiated the present leadership. After getting these facts the President had no alternative.

The Marines are now ashore and this is the only way to protect the Americans. There are great numbers there. I applaud the action of the President. He had to act as he did. I am sure he will have the backing of the Congress and of the American people because had he not acted, Castro—and it was his intention to do so—could well have taken charge of the Dominican Republic. We cannot and must not permit such a thing to happen as happened in Cuba. It will happen if we are not firm and if we had not acted as we have.

LANDING OF MARINES IN THE DOMINICAN REPUBLIC

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, our distinguished majority leader, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ALBERT], and the distinguished chairman of the House Committee on Armed Services, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS], have already said much more eloquently and authoritatively than I can say what I came to the floor today to remark upon.

Mr. Speaker, there is no question of the fact that the landing of our marines in the Dominican Republic is a matter of very grave import. There is no question of the fact that having our marines in battle positions in this capital city poses a very grave crisis in our relations in the Western Hemisphere. But I believe the President has undoubtedly been in possession of information on this subject which has not been available to most of us. I believe further that the course of wisdom is to give to him the full and strong support which our Presidents have uniformly commanded in the actions which they have taken to protect American interests around the world. To me it is encouraging that our good friends and neighbors in Latin America are urging restraint on the subject in the reactions of the capitals of those countries on this subject as the Council of the Organization of American States meets today.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that in the halls of this great body and the other body on the other side of the Capitol and across the country there can be restraint in any criticism of the President's actions at this time and support for the Chief Executive and Commander in Chief as he endeavors to meet a fresh threat to freedom and justice in the democracies in the Western Hemisphere.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 83]

| | | |
|---------------|--------------|--------------|
| Ashbrook | Halpern | Pepper |
| Ashley | Hanna | Powell |
| Blatnik | Harris | Redlin |
| Bolton | Harvey, Ind. | Resnick |
| Broyhill, Va. | Hawkins | Schisler |
| Corman | Hays | Scott |
| Culver | Holland | Senner |
| Daddario | Jarman | Sisk |
| Dawson | Jones, Ala. | Steed |
| Dingell | Lindsay | Todd |
| Dow | Madden | Toll |
| Dulski | Mathias | Tupper |
| Evans, Colo. | May | Van Deerlin |
| Farnsley | Moeller | Waggonner |
| Gialmo | Morrison | White, Idaho |
| Gibbons | Nix | Willis |
| Goodell | O'Brien | Young |
| Green, Oreg. | Olson, Minn. | |

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall, 380 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Education and Labor may sit during general debate during the session of the House this afternoon.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION BILL, 1965

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H.R. 7091) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, since this bill is over \$109 million more than was approved by the House a couple or three weeks ago, may I assume the gentleman will take ample time to explain where these increases occur and why?

Mr. MAHON. I shall undertake to do so and will be glad to yield to the gentleman for any inquiries or statement he wishes to make.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Texas and withdraw my reservation of objection.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. SAYLOR. Will it be possible to get a separate vote on one of the items in disagreement?

The SPEAKER. If an item is reported in disagreement, that would call for separate action.

Mr. SAYLOR. Will it be possible to get a separate vote on an item involving veterans' insurance?

Mr. MAHON. Yes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. NO. 270)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 7091) "making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, and for other purposes," having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 33, 34, 37, and 56.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 4, 7, 12, 13, 14, 25, 31, 32, 38, 43, 44, 45, 48, 50, 51, 54, 57, 58, 59, 60, 61, 62, 63, 64, 65, 66, 67, 68, and 69, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 1: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$2,960,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 2: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 2, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$2,376,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 8: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 8, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$4,305,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 9: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 9, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$2,750,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 23: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 23, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$1,985,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 24: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 24, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$89,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 35: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 35, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert:

"COMMISSION ON INTERNATIONAL RULES OF JUDICIAL PROCEDURE

"Salaries and expenses

"For expenses necessary for the Commission on International Rules of Judicial Procedure, \$25,000, to remain available until May 1, 1965."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 36: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 36, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken and inserted by said amendment, insert "\$9,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 39: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 39, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$300,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 40: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 40, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$717,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 41: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 41, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amend-

ment insert "\$32,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 42: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 42, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$1,575,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 46: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 46, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$300,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 47: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 47, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$325,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 49: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 49, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$50,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 52: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 52, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$1,225,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 53: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 53, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$14,153,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 55: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 55, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$16,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 3, 5, 6, 10, 11, 15, 26, 27, 28, 29, and 30.

GEORGE MAHON,
ALBERT THOMAS,
MICHAEL J. KIRWAN,
JAMIE L. WHITTEN,
JOHN J. ROONEY,
JOHN E. FOGARTY,
WINFIELD K. DENTON,
FRANK T. BOW,
CHARLES R. JONAS,
MELVIN R. LAIRD,
ROBERT H. MICHEL,
JOHN O. PASTORE,
SPESSARD L. HOLLAND,
CARL HAYDEN,
ALLEN J. ELLENDER,
LISTER HILL,
ROBERT C. BYRD,
MILTON R. YOUNG,
LEVERETT SALTONSTALL,
THOMAS H. KUCHEL,

Managers on the Part of the House.

Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 7091), making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying

conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

TITLE I

Chapter I

Department of Agriculture

Amendment No. 1: Appropriates \$2,960,000 for "Research" instead of \$2,860,000 as proposed by the House and \$3,109,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 2: Appropriates \$2,376,000 for "Plant and animal disease and pest control" instead of \$2,176,000 as proposed by the House and \$2,417,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 3: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment; the action to be proposed is in no way to be considered as prejudging the program for the ensuing fiscal year.

Amendment No. 4: Appropriates \$1,137,000 for "meat inspection" as proposed by the Senate instead of \$1,047,000 as proposed by the House.

Chapter III

Foreign Operations

Amendment No. 5: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to concur in the Senate amendment which will permit the Peace Corps to use an additional sum of \$1,858,000 for administrative expenses.

Chapter IV

Independent Offices

Amendment No. 6: Reported in disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to insist upon disagreement.

Amendment No. 7: Appropriates \$35,000,000 for "Disaster relief" as proposed by the Senate instead of \$25,000,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 8: Appropriates \$4,305,000 for "Construction, public buildings projects" (Ogden, Utah) instead of \$4,055,000 as proposed by the House and \$4,506,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 9: Appropriates \$2,750,000 for "Operating expenses, Federal Supply Service" instead of \$1,331,500 as proposed by the House and \$4,166,500 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 10: Reported in disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to insist upon disagreement.

Amendment No. 11: Reported in disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to insist upon disagreement.

Amendment No. 12: Appropriates \$30,000,000 for "Urban renewal fund (liquidation of contract authorization)" as proposed by the Senate. The House bill contained nothing on this item.

Amendment No. 13: Appropriates \$8,320,000 for "Annual contributions, Public Housing Administration" as proposed by the Senate instead of \$13,000,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 14: Appropriates \$150,000,000 for "Compensation and pensions, Veterans' Administration" as proposed by the Senate instead of \$108,000,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 15: Reported in disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to concur in the Senate amendment.

Chapter V

Department of the Interior

Amendment No. 16: Deletes Senate language to authorize \$15,000 for travel and transportation of persons, National Park Service.

Amendments No. 17 and 18: Delete the Senate proposal to allow \$8,000 for travel and transportation of persons under the appropriation for "Construction, National Park Service", and appropriate \$580,000 as proposed by the House instead of \$1,300,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendments No. 19 and 20: Apportion funds in the manner proposed by the House instead of the Senate relating to land and water conservation funds. This action is taken without prejudice to the Senate proposal which can be given further consideration in connection with the regular annual appropriation bill.

Amendment No. 21: Deletes Senate language relating to acquisition of land for Grand Teton National Park.

Amendment No. 22: Appropriates \$550,000 for "Surveys, investigations, and research, Geological Survey" as proposed by the House instead of \$800,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 23: Appropriates \$1,985,000 for "Salaries and expenses, Office of Water Resources Research" instead of \$985,000 as proposed by the House and \$2,825,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Chapter VI

Department of Labor

Amendment No. 24: Appropriates \$89,000,000 for "Manpower development and training activities" instead of \$75,000,000 as proposed by the House and \$103,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 25: Appropriates \$11,000,000 for "Unemployment compensation for Federal employees and ex-servicemen" as proposed by the Senate instead of \$14,000,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 26: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to concur in the Senate amendment.

Department of Health, Education, and Welfare

Amendment No. 27: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

Amendment No. 28: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to concur in the Senate amendment.

Amendment No. 29: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

Chapter VII

Legislative Branch

Amendment No. 30: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to concur in the Senate amendment.

Amendment No. 31: Appropriates \$8,000 for "Folding documents, Senate," as proposed by the Senate.

Chapter VIII

Department of Defense—Civil

Amendment No. 32: Appropriates \$1,735,000 for "operation and maintenance, Corps of Engineers" as proposed by the Senate instead of \$1,500,000 as proposed by the House.

Chapter IX

Department of Justice

Amendment No. 33: Appropriates \$3,750,000 for "Buildings and facilities, Federal Prison System" as proposed by the House instead of \$4,300,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Department of Commerce

Amendment No. 34: Deletes Senate proposal to appropriate \$293,000 for "Registration and voting statistics, Bureau of the Census." This item was disallowed without prejudice, the conferees feeling that the matter should

be settled at a later date after action has been taken on pending voting-rights legislation. The amount proposed in the amendment would have been available for only two months—an insufficient period of time to accomplish worthwhile results, and a greater sum as proposed in the budget estimate would have been subject to a point of order.

Commission on International Rules of Judicial Procedure

Amendment No. 35: Appropriates \$25,000 for "salaries and expenses" instead of \$50,938 as proposed by the Senate. The conferees further agreed with the statement in the Senate report (No. 167) to wit: "the Committee directs that the Commission not incur any obligations payable with appropriated funds on or after May 1, 1965".

United States Information Agency

Amendment No. 36: Appropriates \$9,000,000 for "Special International Exhibitions" instead of \$8,000,000 as proposed by the House and \$11,700,000 as proposed by the Senate; and deletes the Senate proposal to allow \$25,000 for representation and entertainment expenses.

TITLE II

**Appalachian regional development
Department of Agriculture**

Amendment No. 37: Appropriates \$100,000 for "Salaries and expenses, Research" as proposed by the House instead of \$200,000 as proposed by the Senate. No funds are provided for planning a fruit and berry laboratory.

Amendments Nos. 38 and 39: Appropriate \$300,000 for "Payments and expenses, Cooperative State Research Service" instead of \$100,000 as proposed by the House and \$500,000 as proposed by the Senate; and permit its use for contracts and grants for basic and applied research.

Amendments Nos. 40 and 41: Appropriate \$750,000 for "Cooperative extension work, Payments and expenses" instead of \$500,000 as proposed by the House and \$1,500,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 42: Appropriates \$1,575,000 for "Conservation operations" instead of \$1,500,000 as proposed by the House and \$1,650,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 43: Appropriates \$600,000 for "Watershed planning" as proposed by the Senate instead of \$400,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendments Nos. 44 and 45: Appropriate \$10,220,000 for "Watershed protection" as proposed by the Senate instead of \$8,000,000 as proposed by the House; and provide \$3,100,000 for loans as proposed by the Senate instead of \$2,500,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 46: Appropriates \$300,000 for "Salaries and expenses, Economic Research Service" instead of \$200,000 as proposed by the House and \$400,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 47: Appropriates \$325,000 for "Salaries and expenses, Farmers Home Administration" instead of \$250,000 as proposed by the House and \$400,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 48: Appropriates \$7,100,000 for the "Direct loan account" as proposed by the Senate instead of \$6,000,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 49: Appropriates \$50,000 for "Salaries and expenses, Rural Community Development Service" instead of \$35,000 as proposed by the House and \$65,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendments Nos. 50, 51 and 52: Appropriate \$2,000,000 for "Forest land management" as proposed by the Senate instead of \$1,500,000 as proposed by the House; authorize \$1,000,000 for acquisition of land as proposed by the Senate instead of \$500,000 as proposed by the House; also appropriate \$1,225,000 for "Forest research" instead of

\$1,125,000 as proposed by the House and \$1,325,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Department of Defense—Civil

Amendment No. 53: Appropriates \$14,153,000 for "Construction, general, Corps of Engineers" instead of \$13,778,000 as proposed by the House and \$14,700,000 as proposed by the Senate. The amount allowed provides \$375,000 for small flood control projects as proposed by the Senate, but disallows the amount of \$547,000 for recreation facilities which was added by the Senate.

Department of the Interior

Amendment No. 54: Authorizes the purchase of not to exceed ten passenger motor vehicles, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 55: Appropriates \$16,000,000 for "Appalachian Region Mining Area Restoration" instead of \$15,850,000 as proposed by the House and \$16,250,000 as proposed by the Senate. The amount allowed provides \$500,000 for evaluation study instead of \$750,000 as proposed by the Senate and \$350,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 56: Appropriates \$1,350,000 for Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife as proposed by the House instead of \$1,750,000 as proposed by the Senate.

TITLE III

Increased pay costs

Amendments Nos. 57-67: Appropriate \$3,426,445 for increased costs of various Senate activities as proposed by the Senate.

TITLE IV

Claims and judgments

Amendments Nos. 68 and 69: Appropriate \$31,411,444 for claims and judgments as proposed by the Senate instead of \$23,643,495 as proposed by the House; and include the items set forth in Senate Document No. 19.

GEORGE MAHON,
ALBERT THOMAS,
MICHAEL J. KIRWAN,
JAMIE L. WHITTEN,
JOHN J. ROONEY,
JOHN E. FOGARTY,
WINFIELD K. DENTON,
FRANK T. BOW,
CHARLES R. JONAS,
MELVIN R. LAIRD,
ROBERT H. MICHEL,

Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to announce that the Committee on Appropriations this morning approved a recommendation of about \$8 billion for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and the bill is scheduled to be before the House for consideration on next Tuesday. We are continuing to move along with these appropriation bills.

Now, Mr. Speaker, today we have the conference report on the second supplemental appropriation bill of the session.

There are three items in disagreement where the committee has insisted upon the House position. They relate to a number of matters, and on one of them the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SAYLOR] has already indicated a desire to be heard.

Mr. Speaker, I believe it would be well if we withheld discussion of these especially controverted questions until we have adopted the conference report. We will have an hour, if necessary, on each of the separate motions. The Members who have an interest will have full opportunity to discuss the issues involved.

Mr. Speaker, insofar as the conference report itself is concerned there is no great controversy.

As the conference report will indicate, there is about \$2.227 billion involved. It is over the House bill by \$109.2 million. It is under the Senate bill by \$30.3 million. It is under the budget estimates by \$52.7 million.

Mr. Speaker, in this supplemental bill we only considered matters generally considered of the greatest urgency. Naturally, there is not the latitude for deep reductions that might otherwise have been taken. So the reduction in the bill, in this \$2.2 billion, is only \$52 million below the budget estimates.

Mr. Speaker, the other body had before it some \$53 million in budget requests not considered by the House. This accounts for a large portion of the increase made by the other body.

Another matter here involves \$30 million which the House disallowed to provide funds under the urban renewal program. The House did not consider this to be of an emergency nature, but it must eventually be paid under the law. The other body put it in the bill and we have agreed to it. We thought it could be provided in the regular bill, but in order to come to agreement with the other body we agreed to it.

Mr. Speaker, I would also call the attention of the Members to the \$100 million contained in the bill for the Small Business Administration in which many are interested. There are, in addition, a large number of items in the bill involving the Department of Agriculture, the District of Columbia, the foreign operations program, independent offices, the Interior Department, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and Labor, the legislative branch, public works, the Departments of Justice, Commerce, and the judiciary as well as the Department of the Treasury. Many of these—most of these, in fact—are of course unchanged from the original House position.

Then we have funds in here for Appalachia, and a lot of money for pay increases. We passed a bill providing for pay increases throughout the Government and appropriations had not previously been made to cover those increases. In many cases the funds were partially absorbed, but not in all cases was that possible. Again the other body did not change the great majority of House amounts.

As I said, Mr. Speaker, I know of no objection to the conference report itself.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Iowa for a question.

Mr. GROSS. It has come to the point in the House of Representatives and in the Congress where regular appropriation bills have less and less meaning; is that not true?

Here you have another supplemental or a deficiency appropriation bill amounting to some \$2.25 billion. So that the regular appropriation bills really do not mean what they say or say what they mean.

Mr. MAHON. I believe that the regular appropriation bills say what they mean. We will probably never get completely away from supplemental and deficiency bills if we follow the pattern of last year. After the regular appropri-

tion bills had been approved, the Congress passed new legislation changing the picture and at least implying additional demands for this current fiscal year, 1965. New legislation, mandatory-type items, and emergency measures account for 85 or 90 percent of the bill, as I recall from figures I gave here on the floor when the bill was before the House earlier this month.

As I said at the time, only limited portions represent amounts eliminated in the regular bills last year. I think the gentleman understands it is a somewhat unusual situation which confronts us.

Mr. GROSS. One notable exception to that is the Commodity Credit Corporation when everyone knew last year this money was going to be required, yet it was withheld from the regular appropriation bill, if I remember correctly.

Mr. MAHON. With respect to the Commodity Credit Corporation, that was in the first supplemental bill earlier in the year, and is not in this bill. We did in that instance underappropriate with the hope that the additional funds would not be required, but the calculations were in error. Requirements were in excess of what had been provided for; the gentleman is correct on that.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. THOMAS. I think the question of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Gross] is certainly a very timely and proper one. May I respectfully point out to him that the Bureau of the Budget and the President's budget messages change from time to time as the situation requires and they specifically stated in the budget message "We are going to send you a new program later in the supplemental" instead of putting it in the January message.

Mr. GROSS. Every 15 minutes or 15 days.

Mr. THOMAS. That has complicated the situation.

Mr. MAHON. The President requested appropriations—new obligatory authority to the extent of about \$106 billion for the fiscal year 1966 which begins on July 1, 1965. He also indicated he would request supplemental sums for fiscal 1965 in the amount of about \$6 billion. So this is not some unexpected action on the part of the Congress. These supplementals were forecast in the President's budget last January.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BOW. I may say to the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations I would hope this practice is not going to continue. It would seem to me that in orderly fiscal policies we should have in our regular bills that which is necessary, and in the deficiency bills that we have deficiencies considered. I would hope that the Bureau of the Budget and the administration would do their planning so we might know. It seems to me the Congress is better informed when we come in with the regular bills and take care of the regular appropriations, and use the deficiency bills for deficiency purposes, in which event it would seem to me we would have much better control of fiscal responsibility.

Mr. MAHON. I believe the situation is somewhat unusual this year. It will not be duplicated next year; at least as far as I can now foresee, that is the situation. It is regrettable that it is necessary to have supplemental or deficiency bills. But I doubt if it is possible to completely avoid deficiency bills, but the numbers and amounts can certainly be minimized. I share the basic views of the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, under permission, I append the customary comparative statistical table on the conference report.

Comparative statement of budget estimates, amounts in House and Senate bills and agreed to in conference—2d supplemental appropriation bill, 1965 (H.R. 7091)

| Chapter | Department or activity | Budget estimates | House bill | Senate bill | Conference action | Conference action compared with— | | |
|---|--|------------------|---------------|---------------|-------------------|----------------------------------|-------------|-------------|
| | | | | | | Budget estimates | House bill | Senate bill |
| I II III IV V VI VII VIII IX X | TITLE I | | | | | | | |
| | Agriculture..... | \$22,563,000 | \$22,083,000 | \$22,663,000 | \$22,473,000 | —\$90,000 | +\$390,000 | —\$190,000 |
| | District of Columbia..... | (1,563,600) | (1,563,500) | (1,563,600) | (1,563,600) | | | |
| | Foreign operations..... | 250,000,000 | 250,000,000 | 250,000,000 | 250,000,000 | | | |
| | Independent offices..... | 268,972,500 | 188,925,400 | 276,038,400 | 267,913,900 | —1,058,600 | +78,988,500 | —8,124,500 |
| | Interior..... | 72,527,000 | 69,602,000 | 72,412,000 | 70,602,000 | —1,925,000 | +1,000,000 | —1,810,000 |
| | Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare..... | 527,900,000 | 496,900,000 | 511,900,000 | 507,900,000 | —20,000,000 | +11,000,000 | —14,000,000 |
| | Legislative..... | 130,000 | 130,000 | 168,000 | 168,000 | +38,000 | | |
| | Public works..... | 14,229,000 | 13,369,000 | 13,604,000 | 13,604,000 | —825,000 | +235,000 | |
| | State, Justice, Commerce, and the judiciary..... | 141,769,000 | 129,390,000 | 133,983,938 | 130,415,000 | —11,354,000 | +1,025,000 | —3,568,938 |
| | Treasury..... | 271,000 | 271,000 | 271,000 | 271,000 | | | |
| | Total, title I..... | 1,298,361,500 | 1,170,670,400 | 1,291,040,338 | 1,263,346,900 | —35,014,600 | +92,676,500 | —27,693,438 |
| | TITLE II | | | | | | | |
| | APPALACHIAN REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT | | | | | | | |
| | Agriculture..... | 42,840,000 | 30,560,000 | 36,810,000 | 35,395,000 | —7,445,000 | +4,835,000 | —1,415,000 |
| | Commerce..... | 248,000,000 | 247,500,000 | 247,500,000 | 247,500,000 | —500,000 | | |
| | Defense—Civil..... | 17,271,000 | 15,778,000 | 16,700,000 | 16,153,000 | —1,118,000 | +375,000 | —547,000 |
| | Health, Education, and Welfare..... | 34,775,000 | 32,000,000 | 32,000,000 | 32,000,000 | —2,775,000 | | |
| | Interior..... | 19,250,000 | 18,000,000 | 18,800,000 | 18,150,000 | —1,100,000 | +150,000 | —650,000 |
| Appalachian Regional Commission..... | 500,000 | 490,000 | 490,000 | 490,000 | —10,000 | | | |
| Total, title II..... | 362,636,000 | 344,328,000 | 352,300,000 | 349,688,000 | —12,948,000 | +5,360,000 | —2,612,000 | |
| TITLE III | | | | | | | | |
| Increased pay costs..... | 587,842,383 | 579,691,188 | 583,117,633 | 583,117,633 | —4,724,750 | +3,426,445 | | |
| TITLE IV | | | | | | | | |
| Claims and judgments..... | 31,411,444 | 23,643,495 | 31,411,444 | 31,411,444 | | +7,767,949 | | |
| Grand total: | | | | | | | | |
| Direct appropriations..... | 2,261,836,327 | 2,099,918,083 | 2,239,454,415 | 2,209,148,977 | —52,687,350 | +109,230,894 | —30,305,438 | |
| Appropriation of receipts..... | 16,012,000 | 16,012,000 | 16,012,000 | 16,012,000 | | | | |
| Special accounts..... | 1,435,000 | 1,435,000 | 1,435,000 | 1,435,000 | | | | |
| Indefinite appropriations..... | 968,000 | 968,000 | 968,000 | 968,000 | | | | |
| Total..... | 2,280,251,327 | 2,118,333,083 | 2,257,869,415 | 2,227,563,977 | —52,687,350 | +109,230,894 | —30,305,438 | |

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. JONAS].

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Speaker, I do not plan to use the entire 5 minutes but do want to take a minute or two to call a few things to the attention of the House

and to the people of the country who will read the RECORD.

I do not expect to discuss the supplemental appropriation bill in detail because we have already heard the pertinent facts about it, namely that it contains \$2.227 billion in supplemental ap-

propriations and \$109 million more than the bill contained as it passed the House.

You have already listened to the interesting colloquy between the gentlemen from Texas [Mr. MAHON and Mr. THOMAS] and the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS] and the gentleman from

Ohio [Mr. Bow], concerning the problems that arise whenever we are requested to approve supplemental appropriations. I was especially pleased to hear the chairman of the great Committee on Appropriations say that he did not expect we would run into a similar situation next year, and I should certainly hope that he is correct. Many items amounting to millions and hundreds of millions of dollars have been packed into this supplemental appropriation bill in order to have them charged up against fiscal year 1965 appropriations although they are not projected for spending until fiscal year 1966 and normally should have been included in regular appropriation bills for 1966. The net effect of this is to make budget requests for 1966 look good in comparison with 1965. It is a gimmick used by budget makers but we should not be misled by it.

We have been reading a lot in the press recently about how fine our fiscal condition is. I read this morning that the anticipated deficit at the end of the current fiscal year is expected to be lower than was visualized last January. First let me say that I am glad that it is going to be lower instead of higher but I cannot generate too much enthusiasm because there is still going to be a substantial deficit. To run any deficit at all in periods of high prosperity cannot be justified. If this Government cannot live within its means during prosperous times, pray what will it do if adversity should ever strike. The time to start living within our means and begin curtailing the national debt is during periods of high prosperity. To lay away something for a rainy day is not too old fashioned for me.

We hear a lot of talk these days about spending under \$100 billion. The truth of the matter is that 10 months of the current fiscal year has passed and spending to date has already crossed the \$100 billion mark. I hold in my hand the daily statement of the U.S. Treasury for April 22, 1965, and it shows that since July 1, 1964, more than \$100 billion have been withdrawn from the U.S. Treasury and spent. This means that our Government is currently spending money at the rate of \$338,983,000 a day which works out to \$14,124,290 per hour and \$235,404 per minute.

I did not trust my own mathematics so I had the computer people make the computation and the figures given come from the computer.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONAS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Referring to the figure of \$100.7 billion to which the gentleman referred, from his analysis of that spending, is that figure accurately to be compared with the estimate of between \$97 and \$98 billion that was forecast as being the outlay for this fiscal year?

Mr. JONAS. This sum would apply to the \$127 billion of cash expenditures expected to be made by the Government out of regular and trust funds during the year.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. It includes trust fund expenditures?

Mr. JONAS. That is right. But we have already in the middle of April of this year gone above the \$100 billion mark and I had this computation made for those who, as I say, may be interested in knowing the current rate of spending by the administration.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Missouri objects to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present, and makes the point of order that a quorum is not present. Evidently, a quorum is not present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 316, nays 55, not voting 62, as follows:

[Roll No. 84]

YEAS—316

| | | |
|--------------------|------------------|-----------------|
| Abbitt | Conte | Hagan, Ga. |
| Abernethy | Conyers | Hagen, Calif. |
| Adair | Cooley | Halleck |
| Adams | Corbett | Hamilton |
| Albert | Crable | Hanley |
| Anderson, Ill. | Curtin | Hansen, Idaho |
| Anderson, Tenn. | Daniels | Hansen, Iowa |
| Andrews, George W. | Davis, Ga. | Hansen, Wash. |
| Andrews, N. Dak. | de la Garza | Hardy |
| Annunzio | Delaney | Harsha |
| Arends | Dent | Harvey, Ind. |
| Aspinall | Denton | Harvey, Mich. |
| Ayres | Donohue | Hathaway |
| Baldwin | Dorn | Hébert |
| Bandstra | Dowdy | Hochler |
| Baring | Downing | Helstoski |
| Barrett | Duncan, Oreg. | Henderson |
| Bates | Dwyer | Herlong |
| Battin | Dyal | Hicks |
| Beckworth | Edmondson | Hollifield |
| Bennett | Edwards, Calif. | Horton |
| Berry | Ellsworth | Howard |
| Bingham | Everett | Hull |
| Boland | Evins, Tenn. | Hungate |
| Bolling | Farbstein | Huot |
| Bonner | Farnum | Ichord |
| Bow | Fascell | Jacobs |
| Brademas | Feighan | Jennings |
| Brooks | Flino | Joelson |
| Broomfield | Fisher | Johnson, Calif. |
| Brown, Calif. | Flood | Johnson, Okla. |
| Burke | Flynt | Johnson, Pa. |
| Burleson | Fogarty | Jonas |
| Burton, Calif. | Foley | Jones, Mo. |
| Burton, Utah | Ford, Gerald R. | Karsten |
| Byrne, Pa. | Ford, William D. | Kastenmeier |
| Cabell | Fountain | Kee |
| Cahill | Fraser | Keith |
| Callan | Frelinghuysen | Kelly |
| Cameron | Friedel | Keogh |
| Carey | Fulton, Pa. | King, Calif. |
| Carter | Fulton, Tenn. | King, Utah |
| Casey | Fuqua | Kirwan |
| Cederberg | Gallagher | Kluczynski |
| Celler | Gathings | Kornegay |
| Chelf | Gettys | Krebs |
| Clancy | Gilbert | Kunkel |
| Clark | Gilligan | Laird |
| Clausen, Don H. | Gonzalez | Landrum |
| Cleveland | Grabowski | Latta |
| Clevenger | Gray | Lippscomb |
| Cohelan | Green, Oreg. | Long, La. |
| Colmer | Green, Pa. | Long, Md. |
| Conable | Greigg | Love |
| | Grider | McCarthy |
| | Griffin | McCulloch |
| | Griffiths | McDade |
| | Gubser | McDowell |

| | | |
|----------------|----------------|--------------------|
| McEwen | Philbin | Smith, Iowa |
| McFall | Pickle | Smith, N.Y. |
| McGrath | Pike | Smith, Va. |
| McMillan | Pirnie | Springer |
| McVicker | Poage | Stafford |
| Macdonald | Powell | Stalbaum |
| Machen | Price | Stanton |
| Mackay | Pucinski | Steed |
| Mackie | Purcell | Stephens |
| Mahon | Quillen | Stubblefield |
| Marsh | Race | Sullivan |
| Martin, Mass. | Randall | Sweeney |
| Martin, Nebr. | Reid, N.Y. | Taylor |
| Matsunaga | Reifel | Teague, Calif. |
| Matthews | Reinecke | Teague, Tex. |
| May | Reuss | Tenzer |
| Meeds | Rhodes, Pa. | Thomas |
| Michel | Rivers, Alaska | Thompson, La. |
| Miller | Rivers, S.C. | Thompson, N.J. |
| Mills | Roberts | Thompson, Tex. |
| Minish | Robison | Trimble |
| Mink | Rodino | Tuck |
| Mize | Rogers, Colo. | Tunney |
| Monagan | Rogers, Fla. | Tuten |
| Moore | Ronan | Udall |
| Moorhead | Roncallo | Ullman |
| Morgan | Rooney, N.Y. | Vanik |
| Morris | Rooney, Pa. | Vigorito |
| Morse | Roosevelt | Vivian |
| Morton | Rosenthal | Walker, N. Mex. |
| Moss | Rostenkowski | Watkins |
| Multer | Roudebush | Watts |
| Murphy, Ill. | Roush | Weitner |
| Murphy, N.Y. | Roybal | Whalley |
| Murray | Rumsfeld | White, Tex. |
| Natcher | Ryan | Whitener |
| Nedzi | Satterfield | Whitten |
| O'Hara, Ill. | St Germain | Widnall |
| O'Hara, Mich. | Saylor | Williams |
| O'Konski | Scheuer | Wilson, Bob |
| Olsen, Mont. | Schmidhauser | Wilson, Charles H. |
| O'Neill, Mass. | Schneebell | Wolf |
| Ottinger | Schweiker | Wright |
| Passman | Secrest | Wyatt |
| Patman | Selden | Yates |
| Patten | Shipley | Zablocki |
| Pelly | Sickles | |
| Pepper | Sikes | |
| Perkins | Slack | |

NAYS—55

| | | |
|----------------|---------------|---------------|
| Andrews, Glenn | Davis, Wis. | MacGregor |
| Ashmore | Derwinski | Martin, Ala. |
| Belcher | Devine | Minshall |
| Bell | Dickinson | Mosher |
| Betts | Dole | Nelsen |
| Bray | Duncan, Tenn. | O'Neal, Ga. |
| Brown, Ohio | Edwards, Ala. | Poff |
| Broyhill, N.C. | Erlenborn | Quie |
| Buchanan | Findley | Rhodes, Ariz. |
| Byrnes, Wis. | Gross | Shriver |
| Callaway | Grover | Skubitz |
| Chamberlain | Gurney | Smith, Calif. |
| Clawson, Del. | Haley | Talcott |
| Collier | Hall | Thomson, Wis. |
| Cramer | Hosmer | Utt |
| Cunningham | Hutchinson | Walker, Miss. |
| Curtis | King, N.Y. | Wydler |
| Dague | Langen | Younger |
| | McClory | |

NOT VOTING—62

| | | |
|---------------|--------------|--------------|
| Addabbo | Goodell | Pool |
| Ashbrook | Halpern | Redlin |
| Blatnik | Hanna | Reid, Ill. |
| Boggs | Harris | Resnick |
| Bolton | Hawkins | Rogers, Tex. |
| Brock | Hays | St. Onge |
| Broyhill, Va. | Holland | Schisler |
| Corman | Irwin | Scott |
| Culver | Jarman | Senner |
| Daddario | Jones, Ala. | Sisk |
| Dawson | Leggett | Staggers |
| Diggs | Lennon | Stratton |
| Dingell | Lindsay | Todd |
| Dow | Madden | Toil |
| Dulski | Mailliard | Tupper |
| Evans, Colo. | Mathias | Van Deerlin |
| Fallon | Moeller | Waggoner |
| Farnsley | Morrison | White, Idaho |
| Garatz | Nix | Willis |
| Gibbons | O'Brien | Young |
| | Olson, Minn. | |

So the conference report was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Gialmo with Mr. Goodell.
Mr. Morrison with Mr. Ashbrook.
Mr. Addabbo with Mrs. Bolton.
Mr. Boggs with Mr. Lindsay.
Mr. St. Onge with Mr. Halpern.

Mr. Schisler with Mr. Tupper.
 Mr. Stagers with Mr. Mailliard.
 Mr. Moeller with Mr. Broyhill of Virginia.
 Mr. Daddario with Mr. Mathias.
 Mr. Waggonner with Mr. Brock.
 Mr. Culver with Mrs. Reid of Illinois.
 Mr. Dingell with Mr. Dawson.
 Mr. Lennon with Mr. Stratton.
 Mr. Sisk with Mr. Resnick.
 Mr. Farnsley with Mr. Fallon.
 Mr. Madden with Mr. Garmatz.
 Mr. Hays with Mr. Blatnik.
 Mr. Harris with Mr. Leggett.
 Mr. Scott with Mr. Dulski.
 Mr. Nix with Mr. O'Brien.
 Mr. Hanna with Mr. Diggs.
 Mr. Pool with Mr. Corman.
 Mr. Toll with Mr. Irwin.
 Mr. Rogers of Texas with Mr. Van Deerlin.
 Mr. White of Idaho with Mr. Dow.
 Mr. Gibbons with Mr. Jarman.
 Mr. Willis with Mr. Young.
 Mr. Holland with Mr. Hawkins.
 Mr. Evans of Colorado with Mr. Todd.
 Mr. Olson of Minnesota with Mr. Senner.

Mr. BRAY changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the first amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 3: Page 2, line 11, insert: "(3) and including \$100,000 for the purpose of extending the screw-worm barrier zone to Arizona and California with cost-sharing from State and local sources of at least 50 per centum of the expenses of production, irradiation and release of the screw-worm flies;"

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. MAHON moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 3 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed, insert the following: "and including \$100,000 for the purpose of extending the screw-worm barrier zone on a limited basis to Arizona and California with cost-sharing from State and local sources of at least 50 per centum of the expenses of production, irradiation and release of the screw-worm flies;"

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 5: Page 4, line 16, insert:

"PEACE CORPS

"During the current fiscal year an additional amount of \$1,858,000 shall be available in the appropriation for 'Peace Corps' for administrative and program support costs."

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. MAHON moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 5 and concur therein.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 6: Page 5, line 8, strike out "\$1,932,000" and insert "\$2,874,000, of which not to exceed \$942,000 shall be for helicopter operations during the current fiscal year."

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. MAHON moves that the House insist upon its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 6.

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, I offer a preferential motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. KEOGH moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 6 and concur therein.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEOGH].

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, if you have never witnessed a very small boy being sent on a great big man's errand, you are witnessing that now.

My devotion, esteem, and respect for our dear and beloved colleague from Texas, the chairman of the Subcommittee on Independent Offices [Mr. THOMAS], knows no bounds. In all the years I have been here I face this task today with the fear that is normally in one, with the trepidation that one should have, and with the hope that the House will hear my plea.

My motion will have the effect of continuing in this second supplemental appropriation bill \$942,000—not millions—\$942,000. That represents an actual binding and, in the opinion of those who know, a legal commitment of the U.S. Government, which one day in one way or another will have to be paid. If that payment is delayed it will be paid in excess of \$942,000.

All we seek here, Mr. Speaker, is to assure and insure the continuation until June 30 of this year of the scheduled helicopter services now being provided in three of the largest cities in the country—New York, Chicago, and Los Angeles. That service has been of immeasurable assistance in the national interests of this country and will continue to be so.

I regret exceedingly that the effect of the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON] will be to terminate without notice these services that have been so well rendered over the past year. We realize and I appreciate the increasing reluctance on the part of the Congress to continue subsidies beyond the point where they are needed. But I submit, Mr. Speaker, for us to fail to give 2 months' notice would be an act of questionable wisdom.

I, therefore, hope, Mr. Speaker, that as much as I regret pitting my inadequate self against the obvious terrific forces of the highly respected and distinguished Committee on Appropriations, for once—for once you will hear my plea and for once you will do the justice that this day calls for lest that justice be denied by being delayed. I hope my motion will prevail.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, will the distinguished gentleman from New York yield?

Mr. KEOGH. I am delighted to yield to my colleague from the great "state" of Brooklyn.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, in addition to commending the distinguished gentleman from New York

[Mr. KEOGH] upon his remarks on this subject here today, I should like to ask him if it is not the fact that the President of the United States, his Bureau of the Budget, and the Civil Aeronautics Board which controls aviation in this country have recommended this requested appropriation—the \$942,000.

Mr. KEOGH. The gentleman as usual is eminently correct. The fact of the matter is that this represents a legal obligation of the U.S. Government.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Exactly; this money has to be paid.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON].

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, the most eminent authorities in the House on this subject are members of the Appropriations Subcommittee on Independent Offices. And the best informed man on this subject is the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS]. He will speak later, but I have listened with so much interest and feeling to the statement of our friend, the gentleman from New York, that I want to make a few remarks about this question.

There are three cities in the United States that have this helicopter service subsidized by the Government. There are at least 39 great cities that are interested in helicopter service. I would suspect that there are more than that.

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I am glad to yield to my friend, the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KEOGH. I have heard this argument made, Mr. Chairman, but I say to you in response to that: However many States there may be that are eligible for this type of service, why penalize the three cities that have had the foresight and the courage to institute this type of service?

Mr. MAHON. Well, I do not want to penalize the three cities that have instituted it—in large part at the cost of the taxpayers. The city of San Francisco has not been penalized. It has helicopter service for which it pays.

Mr. KEOGH. You may not want to penalize the three cities but you certainly are penalizing them by your motion. But I do want to refer to San Francisco. I think the facts will show that that operation, operating without a subsidy, is losing at the rate of \$1,250,000 a year, which loss is taken by the affiliate companies operating that service. So they are in fact being indirectly subsidized by the provisions of the Internal Revenue Code.

Mr. MAHON. I thank the gentleman for his contribution. My colleagues, you can see that there is more involved here than catches the eye. This is not something that came up the day before yesterday. Since 1947, one or more of these three cities have been getting subsidized helicopter service. I think it was an excellent idea to try it on an experimental basis.

It has now been tried in at least one of the cities for more than 15 years, and

the operators are not able to run it without a Government subsidy.

We ought to do one of two things. Either we ought to eliminate the subsidized program for the three cities or we ought to enlarge it to cover other cities which are interested in this kind of service.

We have had a lot of time now to test out the service. It has not proved to be successful from an economic standpoint in these three cities.

But there is even more involved here than an experiment in three cities. There is a question of principle, a question of the dignity and the integrity of the Congress is involved in this issue. We must not only be heard but heeded.

It is occasionally said in the press and elsewhere that Congress has lost control of the purse strings. If agencies are able to do what they are undertaking to do in this instance, then to a considerable extent Congress has lost control of the purse strings, and there could be almost no end to the consequences.

We do not have the same platform from which we can address ourselves to the people as the executive branch has. But if we ever forfeit the power of the purse, "we have had it." That power is the supreme power of the Congress, representing the people, over the Government and the control of the Government.

This is the issue. I point it out in this way: From year to year we have been complaining about this program. We have been wrestling with this issue. We have been trying to get this service on a paying basis. But we have failed.

Mr. THOMAS' subcommittee last year, working with the other body on the conference report on the bill carrying an appropriation for this item, put some pertinent information in the conference report on page 13. And there was, in addition, in the appropriation law itself last year a specific limitation on the fiscal 1965 funds for these services.

This is the reason why I say the stature and integrity and prestige of Congress is in a measure involved here. I read from page 13 of the Independent Offices conference report of last year: "and authorize \$3,358,000 for subsidy for helicopter operations instead of \$3 million as proposed by the House and \$4,300,000 as proposed by the Senate."

The appropriation law reads as follows: "including not to exceed \$3,358,000 for subsidy for helicopter operations during the current fiscal year."

So, the conference committee put in \$3,358,000 for helicopter service in last year's bill. That was approved by Congress. The Congress turned over authority to spend an appropriation of \$3,358,000 to the executive branch for this helicopter service for these three cities. The amount was limited to a sum certain.

This was the package. Officials did not get all they wanted, so it was up to them at that time to tailor the program within the \$3,358,000.

Let me also read the language in the statement of the conferees which accompanied the conference report last

year on the \$3,358,000:

This is the last money to be recommended by the committee for these projects exclusively.

You see, they were told. The Bureau of the Budget was told. The CAB was told. Everybody involved was told that "this is the last money to be recommended for these projects exclusively." Continuing to read the statement:

The conferees respectfully request—

Do we have to get down on our knees every day to a Government agency which we create? Are we men or mice? What is our attitude? Do we have a right to the respect of the country? Is the prestige of Congress involved here? Of course it is.

The conferees respectfully request the CAB not to include 1 penny for these three lines in its budget next year.

What has it done? Here we are faced with a supplement of \$942,000 to the \$3,358,000, in the regular bill for fiscal 1965. This is a complete flouting of the action of Congress by the executive branch.

I continue to quote from the statement of last year:

This position is unanimously agreed to by the House conferees and a majority of the conferees of the Senate.

They spoke not for the Appropriations Committee, but for the Congress, because the conference report was adopted in both Houses.

Let me quote again the entire part of the paragraph relating to helicopter subsidies:

And authorize \$3,358,000 for subsidy for helicopter operations instead of \$3 million as proposed by the House and \$4,300,000 as proposed by the Senate. The conferees have been wrestling many years with continuing subsidies for helicopter service for 3 cities while 39 other cities need it as badly as those that now have it. This is the last money to be recommended by the committee for these projects exclusively. The conferees respectfully request the CAB not to include 1 penny for these three lines in its budget next year. This position is unanimously agreed to by the House conferees and a majority of the conferees of the Senate.

So, in utter disregard of the will of the Congress, as so well and succinctly put in the report, the Civil Aeronautics Board has gone along and has been overspending, has not tailored the helicopter program to the funds available, as every family should try to do in handling money matters, and which every child knows is the right way to proceed. It has flouted the will of Congress in this matter. It has also asked for funds, in direct opposition to the expressed view of Congress, for the next fiscal year—\$2,100,000 for fiscal 1966—and is planning to run this program until 1970.

As one Member of Congress who is not too interested in this from the standpoint of any service involved but who is interested in the prestige of Congress and the preeminence of Congress in money matters, I respectfully dissent, and I say to the CAB that Congress has control of the purse and that we do not intend to tolerate a continuation of this

program in the face of the action of Congress last year. We do not intend to let the agency determine the appropriation. That is the business of Congress and must remain so.

That is where I stand, and that is where every Member of the House ought to stand.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. MAHON. I will be glad to.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEOGH], in the course of his address indicated that this was a legal obligation of the U.S. Government. Will the gentleman from Texas tell us whether this is true or not? As I understand it, the Civil Aeronautics Board takes the position that the law on the books requires them to establish this subsidy. Does the chairman of the committee contend that the words of the committee in its report amount to a repealer of the law which is on the books?

Mr. MAHON. The law authorizes the establishment of subsidies. Officials could subsidize under the law, if they had the money, dozens of cities for helicopter services, as I understand the law. So, yes; the law permits this to be done. But Congress only provided funds for the three cities, and the Congress has to find ways of meeting its responsibility for itself and to the people. So what shall we do when we are trampled upon by a Government agency which is the creature of the Congress? Shall we fight back? I think we should fight back. How can we? By denying funds. Where contracts have been made there is a legal responsibility, and if we can get our will established with respect to these funds, these funds can be appropriated by the Congress or could be provided by the Court of Claims. But the course we advocate here is the only avenue we have at the present time to project the determination and the will of Congress with respect to these matters, and no one will be deprived of any legal right thereby. We all know, if they are entitled to the funds, they can get the funds, and I would be perfectly glad to join in appropriating the funds after the subsidies have been terminated and after the Civil Aeronautics Board has seen fit to follow the mandate of Congress on the issue of subsidizing helicopter service to cities.

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to my good friend from New York.

Mr. KEOGH. I think I should assure the gentleman from Texas that I share his views with respect to the necessity for maintaining the dignity and powers of the House of Representatives and of the Congress of the United States. I join with you in that. However, my point is simply that this is the wrong way to assert yourself. You are using a meat ax here when you should really reach for a surgeon's scalpel. That is all. Because you admit it is a liability. You know they are going to collect it and it is going to be increased by the costs involved and the interest. In the meantime you are terminating a service such as we have in New York where we are just about to open the operation on top

of the Pan Am Building, the use of which by the President and the Vice President of the United States will more than make up this subsidy business. It is so thoughtless in my opinion. Excuse me for seeming to be strong about it, but it is shortsighted to do this in this way at this time.

Mr. MAHON. The gentleman's views are of interest, and if I were in New York City or in Los Angeles or in Chicago, I think I would see the issue in this same way. We are confronted with the problem. If we can use a small surgeon's knife to accomplish the results, all right. However, if the authority of Congress is involved and the only way we can protect ourselves is with a meat ax, then I say let us use the meat ax.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BOW. The gentleman has said about what I was going to say a minute ago. It seems to me the Congress used a scalpel last year and in this very gentle operation we gave them an opportunity to cut the cord with the funds provided for them. This House passed that bill with the provision in it that there should be no more. What this is is simply a restoration of funds which Congress cut last year.

Are we going to pass bills with cuts and tell the agencies how to spend the money, and then have them disregard completely what we have told them on the theory that they could come back here and bludgeon us to give them the money later on in a supplemental? I think that is a mistake. I think we have got to stand by the committee on this and by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS] who has made a study of this; because that committee and this House supported them last year in a reduction of the funds. This is an attempt to come back here and suggest that an agency downtown will disregard the reports of the committee and the action of the Congress and say, "You have got to give it to us in a supplemental bill." I think it is the wrong way to approach the matter.

Mr. MAHON. I think the gentleman is correct.

And if we in Congress do not stand up for our own prerogatives it is certain no one else is going to.

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield.

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the distinguished chairman's yielding.

I am very sensitive to the remarks made with regard to the authority of Congress in this matter. However, it is my understanding, after talking with Chairman Alan Boyd of the CAB, that the matter that is at stake here, as he told it to me, is this: He has said—

In our judgment—

Meaning the CAB—

If this supplemental is not put back in the bill the carriers could be put out of business.

I asked him most particularly whether that was his clear and thoughtful judgment, that the effect of this action could

put the carriers out of business. He assured me that that was the case. And he said in addition that he thought that should this action be taken here, that is proposed today, there could be a suit in the court of claims which could result possibly in a more substantial payment or a payment of "at least" the amount involved in the bill. He thought that this was a clear, legal obligation of the United States and would be so upheld.

So my question to the chairman is this: If this has the effect of or runs the risk of putting the carriers out of business, is there not some remedy that could be applied to continue until such time as a more equitable formula could be worked out?

Mr. MAHON. We do not know whether it will put the carriers out of business. We would hope that they might be able to carry on without a subsidy, as is the case in San Francisco. But the agency has shown that it has not the slightest intention of complying with the wishes of Congress. It went ahead with a program which utilizes more than the \$3 million plus Congress appropriated for the helicopter subsidy. Not only that, in the budget estimate for next year, 1966 the sum of \$2.1 million has been included. So this is an indication that officials are saying, "We know what Congress did but we do not approve it and therefore, regardless of the action of Congress, we are going to proceed as we desire."

We cannot tolerate that. We must not tolerate that.

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for just one further question?

Mr. MAHON. I yield.

Mr. REID of New York. The point here it seems to me is this. I cannot comment on the gentleman's testimony on this point other than to say that whatever the testimony before the gentleman's great committee and the undertakings that were made, is it correct, is it proper to penalize the public interest and convenience? Because if there is any validity in the concern that the Chairman of the CAB has indicated to me, that the carriers might go out of business, then in effect, because of the relationship between the Congress and the CAB, we are penalizing the public interest and a young industry that is trying to serve both the national defense and the country. Have we the right to penalize the public regardless of undertakings that may or may not have been made between the committee and the CAB?

Mr. MAHON. I would say that these people have been getting this service a long time at a rather heavy cost in subsidies. Other cities have been trying to get into the picture and have not been able to do so. We have asked that this experiment be terminated. We gave the agency \$3 million plus with which to tailor its program for this fiscal year. The act and the will of Congress have not been complied with. It is time for us to stand firm.

Mr. Speaker, I now yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS] who as I stated before is the best in-

formed Member of the House on this issue.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, let me address myself to this subject and let us clear away the cobwebs.

It has been said that no notice has been given. It has been said that it is a legal debt and there will be a judgment plastered against us.

Mr. Speaker, let us see the beginning of all this thing. You know how long it has been in operation? A little bit better than 15 long years. Do you know what these three cities have cost us? Right at \$48 million. Has this been for the mutual benefit of the cities involved? Let us be frank about it. It is a direct subsidy to the major trunklines.

Mr. Speaker, studies have been made and they show beyond any doubt that the vast majority—not all, of course, but the vast majority—of the traffic served in these areas are out-of-town businessmen whose time is very valuable and they are willing to pay a premium to go from one airport to another.

This got started as an experiment, listen, as an experiment. To do what? To haul mail; to haul mail, not people. It was too expensive and it was dropped for that purpose.

Mr. Speaker, I have never seen in my experience here on this floor the pressure brought to bear on any one little item as that which has come up on this. That sugar that these operators are getting tastes mighty good and they just do not want to give it up. When it would not work for mail, then they said, "Well, let us experiment and we can develop the helicopter."

You are sure going to develop the helicopter through carrying a little 30-pound, 40-pound, or 50-pound bag of mail, when the armed services have hundreds and hundreds of them and they are in use every day in Vietnam.

So, where does the experiment go? Here, gentlemen, is the proposition.

As our distinguished chairman has pointed out to the Members, we have mentioned it on this floor every year for the last 6 or 7 years—and I shall not call any Members' names but I can see them here—they have got up and chided this little subcommittee for not ending this subsidy. You have heard it. I have heard it and everyone has heard it, and we have moaned and groaned and have asked them to either quit or cut bait.

Mr. Speaker, there are 39 other cities who want this and one is just as much entitled to it as another. It is all taxpayers' money. It goes to the use and benefit of the big trunklines.

Mr. Speaker, if we wind this up, the trunklines will work out this problem in less than 6 or 8 months, just as sure as shooting, in one form or another.

Now, they say this is a debt. You know whose story that is, and I say that with great humility and respect. Not even the Civil Aeronautics Administration will tell us positively about it. They say they think it is. Well, if they think it is, why not then subsidize that little line in San Francisco? Are there not other lines which are just as much entitled to this subsidy as the line that is

operating further down south in California? Can you make fish out of one and fowl out of another?

Mr. Speaker, if they thought it was a legal obligation why did they not subsidize some of the other 39? Can you imagine any place on earth where you need it any more than from Washington to Dulles Airport or Washington to Baltimore or in Boston, as well as hundreds of other cities such as Atlanta, Cleveland, and so forth?

Mr. Speaker, it is not a debt in my humble judgment, and if I am wrong I will get up on this floor and tell you I am wrong. But it looks to me as if the Civil Aeronautics Board does not think it is a debt, because if they did, they would subsidize the other 39 and equalize it.

But of all the effrontery I have seen in a long time by governmental agencies created by this Congress, this is it, and there are good men on that Board. They are just as fine as any I know. But their great trouble, Mr. Speaker, is they want to spend the money and appropriate it too. That conference report was clear as a bell. We finally said, "We respectfully ask you to listen to us, we have been pleading with you for 6 or 7 years."

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMAS. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. You have me convinced. I suggest that the gentleman turn around and address his remarks to those on his side of the aisle who do not seem to be convinced.

Mr. THOMAS. In my humble opinion this is not a debt. They have had notice, not 1 year, not 2 years, not 3 years, not 4 years, but 5 and 6 years. We have gotten up here pleading just as we are doing now. Then they talk about a meat ax and no notice.

How much notice did they need? They are not going to do a thing in the world, and neither will the Civil Aeronautics Board. Let us do even-handed justice. You have taken the major trunklines off of direct subsidies. You give it to them in an indirect way.

Mr. Speaker, I hope the preferential motion is voted down—and it should be voted down. It is just giving even-handed justice, and I hope the committee will support your Appropriations Committee.

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMAS. I yield to my beloved friend from New York, who has announced he is going to retire. If he will listen to me he will be here another 30 or 40 years. He is beloved, he is chairman of our caucus, and if he has an enemy on the floor I do not know who it is.

Mr. KEOGH. My dearly beloved friend virtually took the words right out of my mouth. I was going to refer to his intention to retire. I hope he never does, I hope he is here for many years, and I say to him, Mr. Speaker, that my admiration and respect for him is exceeded by no one.

I would say further to him that when my preferential motion is adopted by the

House I will love him just as much as I do now.

Mr. THOMAS. That will be mutual. Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMAS. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MICHEL. I appreciate the gentleman yielding. I have asked the chairman for some time on my own, but since the gentleman has been good enough to yield I might mention the fact so many x millions of dollars have been voted over the years for subsidies to the helicopter service, and to the ones that are in operation. This figure pales into insignificance somewhat when you realize the testimony given before a committee in the other body in March of this year.

Mr. THOMAS. What is the question?

Mr. MICHEL. I am going to make the point if I may.

Mr. THOMAS. Go ahead.

Mr. MICHEL. The Defense Department witnesses say that the Defense Department has saved \$70 million by the experience of the S-58 helicopter in the Chicago area alone.

Mr. THOMAS. I do not know where they got that figure or where the gentleman got it, but if he says it is true I will buy it.

Mr. MICHEL. The gentleman makes the point of the experience we have had in South Vietnam, but in substantially the same period helicopters are being utilized to the extent of 5 to 1 what they are in the military, and I say that is an experience that is of real consequence.

Mr. THOMAS. They are getting some rough treatment in Vietnam.

I thank the gentleman for his observation.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MICHEL].

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, of course, it is always very difficult to follow the very distinguished and able gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS]. As a matter of fact, it is just about as difficult as following the junior Senator from Illinois, the distinguished minority leader, EVERETT DIRKSEN, but I do believe that there is another side to this story, and that these facts ought to be known to make the record complete.

My good friend, the distinguished chairman of our Appropriations Committee, made reference to last year's conference report in the course of his remarks, and that report was the subject of discussion in recent hearings on helicopter air service before the Aviation Subcommittee of the Senate. Senator MONRONEY was presiding and said on page 25 of those hearings:

The Chair is in doubt whether a majority of the conferees of the Senate did agree to the House position. I recall no vote that was taken in the closed conference that was held, and, of course, it was not a matter of record anyway, because the Senate conferees could have spoken out by official voice at the time the conference report was adopted if they had concurred in the House conference, which they did not.

I might say that there were several of us as House conferees in the conference yesterday who are not in agreement with the House position and have as a matter

of fact spoken out on this matter on previous occasions.

The funds previously provided for the helicopter carriers for this fiscal year were exhausted on April 11, 1965, and presently there are no funds to take them through the period from April 11 to June 30, 1965.

The \$942,000 is needed to bridge this gap, and a supplemental appropriation in this amount has been requested by the administration. This request is set forth on page 21 of House Document No. 80 containing the communication from the President of the United States.

There are several reasons why it is vital for the House to approve this supplemental appropriation for the helicopter carriers.

Without this money, the scheduled helicopter industry in the three largest cities of the United States, New York, Los Angeles, and Chicago, would collapse within the next several weeks. One of the most promising new forms of transportation would be killed off just as it is beginning to demonstrate its capability of getting off of subsidy within a reasonable time.

The opposition to helicopter subsidy here in the Congress seems to be based on a misunderstanding that it is being used simply to defray the cost of a local transportation service in New York, Chicago, and Los Angeles, which unjustly discriminates in favor of these three cities and against other cities which also need but do not have helicopter service.

The fact is that these three operations were created by the Civil Aeronautics Board to operate as national helicopter laboratories, to develop the art of helicopter transportation to the point where it can become self-sustaining and then spread to other cities, employing the advances gained in these operations. The transportation service which these three carriers provide is only a necessary incident to the more important developmental function they are performing.

What we are buying with this subsidy is the maintenance of incubators or test beds which are developing for future national application this newest form of air transportation and the only form that can bring air transportation closer than airports to the people that use it.

The Congress itself has expressed interest in having helicopter service extended to new cities. In acting on the appropriation for fiscal 1963, the Senate voted to increase helicopter subsidy to \$10 million, to provide for additional services. Last year, when the House conferees requested the exclusion of helicopter subsidy from the budget this year, there was an indication that this might help to get service for "39 other cities that need it as badly as those that now have it."

Actually, the reverse is true, because the quickest way to advance an expansion of helicopter service to other cities is by first perfecting the existing operations, after which new services in new cities can be authorized on a nonsubsidy basis.

Hence, what is at stake here today is not only the existing helicopter services in the three largest cities of the Nation

but also the extension of service to other cities, which would be impaired if the present development program were to be snuffed out by cutting off all of the funds.

The helicopter carriers have been criticized because of the length of time it has taken for them to become free of subsidy. However, the delay has largely been beyond their control. They were delayed in getting their turbine-powered equipment. After the new equipment was delivered, the in-service debugging of the aircraft took substantially longer than expected.

Progress has also been deterred by the length of time it has taken to get instrument flight rules authority, which is essential to achieve high schedule performance and reliability, and the higher revenues which come with more reliable service. It has taken time to increase the period between overhauls on the new equipment and its components, which has kept costs at a higher level until the overhaul period could be increased.

These and other factors have accounted for the economic improvement of the carriers not having been more accelerated than it has been, and the delays encountered have been largely attributable to the uniqueness of this new breed of flying machine and the complexities it involves.

What is important today, is that the improvement in these helicopter carriers is now moving forward to the point where the CAB has just found—in orders Nos. E-21798 and 21799—that the two carriers receiving 82 percent of the total subsidy—New York and Los Angeles—can be expected to break even without subsidy in fiscal 1969. The third carrier—Chicago can be expected to do the same with the further activation of Midway Airport in Chicago.

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MICHEL. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KEOGH. Can the gentleman affirm for me the fact that I have stated, that the San Francisco operation is running at a net loss in excess of \$1 million, which is used as a tax carryover in connection with other operations?

Mr. MICHEL. The gentleman is absolutely correct.

Mr. KEOGH. This is subsidizing San Francisco to the extent of 49 percent of its loss.

Mr. MICHEL. The gentleman is correct. He serves on the Committee on Ways and Means and knows whereof he speaks.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, will the distinguished gentleman from Illinois yield?

Mr. MICHEL. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I should like to remind the gentleman from Illinois that at the conference on yesterday, as one of the House conferees, I took the position favoring the appropriation and agreed with the Senate conferees whose views were principally voiced by the distinguished senior Senator from California, Mr. KUCHEL. At that time I pointed out that

in most of the capitals of Europe there is 100 percent government-subsidized helicopter service; that here in this country in our three largest cities—and the three largest cities here are larger than most of the capital cities of Europe—we have only partially government-subsidized service. I should also mention the fact that at one time years ago this helicopter subsidy was a very substantial one. The government subsidy has now been brought down as the result of superior operating know-how and the more economical operations of these three helicopter companies.

Mr. Speaker, I sincerely hope the motion offered by the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. KEOGH] will prevail.

Mr. MICHEL. I thank the gentleman. I would say further, Mr. Speaker, that the collapse of the scheduled helicopter industry in our three largest cities could impair this country's world leadership in the field of vertical-lift aircraft.

The cessation of service in these three cities would receive worldwide attention because of the many international users of the service and the many representatives from countries throughout the world who visit these carriers seeking advice and assistance in the formulation of their own helicopter service plans.

U.S.-manufactured helicopters are being used in transport operations in a number of foreign countries, and a real stigma would ensue from closing down our own helicopter carriers while at the same time foreign operators were carrying on with the same kind of U.S. equipment which we ourselves have not seen fit to continue in service.

Lack of confidence in our helicopter products would inevitably follow, and existing and foreseeable foreign markets would be impaired as foreign competitors capitalized on the situation. Thus, our balance of payments could be adversely affected in a substantial way.

Another reason why this country cannot afford to scuttle its helicopter transport industry is the growing need for such a vehicle to combat the increasing congestion in urban areas.

Population studies show that by 1980 more than 72 percent of the U.S. population will be squeezed into our metropolitan areas, and the resultant congestion will require a whole new kit of transportation tools.

The helicopter is one of the most promising new transportation tools, because it operates in a new dimension lying above surface congestion on the ground and beneath the congestion of fixed-wing airplanes in the air.

Three Presidents of the United States have demonstrated that the helicopter is practical and safe and does a good job of jumping over ground transportation tangles on short-haul local and interurban flights.

One of the greatest challenges the helicopter has to offer is its potential of replacing fixed-wing aircraft on short-haul intercity operations in highly congested areas, and thus dispense with millions of dollars of otherwise needed additional airport facilities and at the same time better serve the passenger by fly-

ing him into the heart of the city instead of depositing him at an outlying airport as is now the case. Under the concept, New York City could forget about building a fourth or fifth airport, by funneling its short-haul operations into heliports and confining its airports to medium- and long-haul operations.

The point I am leading up to is that the continuation of the scheduled helicopter industry is far too important a matter to be determined by a supplemental appropriation covering less than a 90-day period. The \$942,000 supplemental appropriation in question here today covers only the 80 days from April 11 to June 30, 1965.

Just last month, the Aviation Subcommittee of the Senate Commerce Committee held extensive hearings on the helicopter air service program and what the policy of the Congress should be on this subject. Certainly, we should retain the status quo until policy determinations have been made as a result of those hearings. It would be most inappropriate for this body prematurely to foreclose this whole inquiry by blocking the supplemental appropriation and putting these carriers out of business before the other body has had time to finish its task.

In closing, I want to add that the issue being debated here today also involves the willingness of the Congress to honor the legal obligations incurred by the U.S. Government.

In the debate this last Tuesday on the floor of the Senate, it was pointed out that the certificates of public convenience and necessity and rate orders issued to the helicopter carriers by the CAB, under the existing Federal Aviation Act, create a legal obligation on the Government to pay out the \$942,000 for which a supplemental appropriation is being requested by the administration. There is a consensus of view that if the Congress does not appropriate this money, the helicopter carriers could successfully prosecute claims in the Court of Claims.

It is my understanding that a change would be required in the basic statute under which the CAB operates in order to eliminate the subsidy obligation to the helicopter carriers. The obligation cannot be eliminated simply by denying appropriations without changing the substantive law.

Those who advocate the termination of helicopter subsidy should address themselves to a change in the law instead of trying to achieve such a result through the appropriation process. I would oppose such a change in the law, and bring up the subject simply to point out the procedural problem involved.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. MAHON. I yield for a question.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Is it not a fact, Mr. Chairman, that what we are asking now—the additional funds—is a part of the CAB's program to phase out this subsidy and put these helicopter services on a pay-as-you-go basis? In other words, this is not part of a permanent, continuing program, but rather part of a plan

established and agreed to by the CAB to phase out this subsidy to the helicopters and make them self-sufficient.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I would say that what we will vote on presently is a preferential motion made by the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEOGH] to overturn the recommendation of the conference committee, which has taken the position that we should insist on the \$3 million being an adequate appropriation for this subsidy program for helicopters for the current fiscal year.

I do hope that Members, on this motion, will vote "No," and then will vote with the committee on the motion to insist upon the House position.

I do hope that the will of the Congress can be carried out, and the will of the Congress can be carried out by voting "No" on the motion which will presently be before us. When the House speaks, it ought not only to be heard but also heeded.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the gentleman from New York's preferential motion that the House recede and concur with the Senate on amendment No. 6 under chapter IV, independent offices. Our two bodies agree on an allowance of \$1,932,000 for the payment of subsidy obligations mainly for local service air carriers. The disagreement is focused on a subsidy of \$942,000 for helicopter operations in Chicago, Los Angeles, and New York. The House failed to include these funds when H.R. 7091 was considered on April 6; however, the Senate believes that funds should be provided for payment of such subsidy obligations so long as the existing certification has not been discontinued by administrative or legislative action.

The Senate displays wisdom supporting an industry that is proving to be a valuable service, not only in the field of public service, but also in the defense structure of our Nation. And the issue at hand is important to the overall purpose of helicopter operations in both areas for the improvements realized in public transportation will benefit the defense phase of helicopter use and save our Government money in experimentation for improvement.

While the funds we now seek are designated to support three specific areas in the United States, the overall effects of the experiment in utilizing helicopters as a means of public transportation will reach out to all areas of this Nation, for as the industry progresses, its benefits will be available to a large majority of our citizenry.

The helicopter trial was launched with far-sighted vision of the needs of our people in expanding metropolitan areas. Traffic congestion is one of the most difficult problems facing our society. When you consider the costs in lost time of productive people who must sit in traffic jams, and the cost of moving freight in congested urban areas, we cannot hope to resolve these losses unless we can provide a solution to reduce travel time from outlying areas to the hub of in-

dustrial and business operations in the heart of these growing metropolitan complexes. The benefits we gain from the increased speed of cross country and intercontinental air travel will not be fully realized if we fail to provide a link between the airport terminals at the perimeter of metropolitan areas and the eventual destination in the center of these areas. The helicopter is the swiftest means of establishing this link.

In Chicago we have realized the need of helicopter service in our overall transportation picture of the city of Chicago and its farflung suburban areas.

We are reactivating Midway Airport on the South Side of Chicago as a supplement to the growing air traffic at O'Hare Field on the far northwest side of our city. Helicopters play an important role in transporting air passengers and air freight between these terminals where connections are made for continued travel to other areas of the United States and continents across the oceans. But this interchange is only one part of the service that can be offered by helicopter transportation. They also proved a swift link between these terminals and Chicago's Loop and there are plans for intercity downtown service from Chicago to nearby cities like Milwaukee and South Bend.

The funds we seek in this amendment will enable the Chicago Helicopter Service and similar services in New York and Los Angeles to remain solvent while establishing their important foothold in the transportation field. If we fail to subsidize these services they will be lost for they have not had sufficient time to become firmly established and self-supporting. The benefits gained to date will be lost and will restrict the potential that can be realized from this service.

Congress had great vision in supporting air travel at its introduction in transportation and we now observe the results of this assistance through the development of modern aircraft and faster travel in the world. The helicopter is an outgrowth of the advancements in air transportation. It can and will develop as an important cog in this mode of travel but we will not realize this importance unless we support its purpose. Therefore Congress should continue its wisdom by assisting this industry to develop its full potential. Although we are seeking aid to only three large metropolitan areas in this amendment, the progress experienced in these areas can produce a self-sustaining industry which will eventually benefit other metropolitan areas and outlying communities. An expanding business helps the economy of our country and the birth of a new business certainly meets with the plans of a great society in the future.

The need for this subsidy has been affirmed by the Civil Aeronautics Board. They have carefully studied the results of the helicopter experiment to date and sustain its position as an important link in air travel. Their plan proposes a phaseout of subsidy payments over a 5-year period. By then the industry will have matured and be self-supporting.

A vote in favor of the motion to recede and concur with the Senate's amendment

to subsidize the helicopter services in Chicago, Los Angeles, and New York will indicate the wisdom of this Congress by continued support of air transportation.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may be permitted to revise and extend their remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the preferential motion offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEOGH].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. KEOGH) there were—ayes 62, noes 77.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 144, nays 228, not voting 61, as follows:

[Roll No. 85]

YEAS—144

| | | |
|-----------------|-----------------|----------------|
| Adams | Griffiths | Philbin |
| Anderson, Tenn. | Grover | Pike |
| Annunzio | Hagen, Calif. | Pirnie |
| Arends | Halleck | Powell |
| Ayres | Hanley | Price |
| Barrett | Hays | Pucinski |
| Bell | Helstoski | Race |
| Bingham | Hicks | Reid, N.Y. |
| Bolton | Holifield | Reinecke |
| Brown, Calif. | Hosmer | Reuss |
| Burke | Howard | Rhodes, Pa. |
| Burton, Calif. | Huot | Rodino |
| Byrne, Pa. | Johnson, Calif. | Rogers, Colo. |
| Byrnes, Wis. | Karsten | Ronan |
| Cahill | Karth | Roncallo |
| Cameron | Kastenmeyer | Rooney, N.Y. |
| Carey | Kee | Rooney, Pa. |
| Celler | Kelly | Roosevelt |
| Clawson, Del. | Keogh | Rosenthal |
| Clevenger | King, Calif. | Rostenkowski |
| Collier | King, N.Y. | Roybal |
| Cooley | King, Utah | Rumsfeld |
| Corbett | Kluczynski | Ryan |
| Daniels | Krebs | St Germain |
| Delaney | Lipscomb | Scheuer |
| Dent | Love | Secrest |
| Derwinski | McCarthy | Sickles |
| Donohue | McDowell | Sisk |
| Dwyer | McEwen | Slack |
| Dyal | McGrath | Smith, Calif. |
| Edwards, Calif. | McVicker | Smith, N.Y. |
| Ellsworth | Macdonald | Stratton |
| Erlenborn | Martin, Mass. | Sweeney |
| Farbstein | Matsunaga | Teague, Calif. |
| Fino | Meeds | Tenzer |
| Foley | Michel | Thompson, N.J. |
| Fraser | Minish | Tunney |
| Frelinghuysen | Moorhead | Ullman |
| Fulton, Pa. | Morgan | Utt |
| Fulton, Tenn. | Moss | Watts |
| Gallagher | Multer | Widnall |
| Gilbert | Murphy, Ill. | Wilson |
| Gilligan | Murphy, N.Y. | Charles H. |
| Grabowski | Nedzi | Wolff |
| Gray | O'Hara, Ill. | Wright |
| Green, Pa. | Olsen, Mont. | Wyder |
| Greigg | Ottlinger | Yates |
| Grider | Patten | Zablocki |
| | Pepper | |

NAYS—228

| | | |
|----------------|----------|-----------|
| Abbott | Andrews | Baldwin |
| Abernethy | Glenn | Bandstra |
| Adair | Andrews | Baring |
| Albert | N. Dak. | Bates |
| Anderson, Ill. | Ashley | Battin |
| Andrews | Ashmore | Beckworth |
| George W. | Aspinall | Belcher |

| | | |
|-----------------|----------------|-----------------|
| Bennett | Griffin | O'Neal, Ga. |
| Berry | Gross | O'Neill, Mass. |
| Betts | Gubser | Passman |
| Boland | Gurney | Patman |
| Bolling | Hagan, Ga. | Pelly |
| Bonner | Haley | Perkins |
| Bow | Hall | Pickle |
| Brademas | Hamilton | Poage |
| Bray | Hansen, Idaho | Poff |
| Brooks | Hansen, Iowa | Pool |
| Broomfield | Hansen, Wash. | Purcell |
| Brown, Ohio | Harsha | Quile |
| Broyhill, N.C. | Harvey, Ind. | Quillen |
| Buchanan | Harvey, Mich. | Randall |
| Burleson | Hathaway | Reid, Ill. |
| Burton, Utah | Hechler | Reifel |
| Cabell | Henderson | Rhodes, Ariz. |
| Callan | Herlong | Rivers, S.C. |
| Callaway | Horton | Roberts |
| Carter | Hull | Robison |
| Casey | Hungate | Rogers, Fla. |
| Cederberg | Hutchinson | Rogers, Tex. |
| Chamberlain | Ichord | Roudebush |
| Chelf | Irwin | Roush |
| Clancy | Jacobs | Satterfield |
| Clausen, | Jennings | Saylor |
| Don H. | Jeolson | Schmidhauser |
| Cleveland | Johnson, Okla. | Schneebell |
| Cohelan | Johnson, Pa. | Schweiker |
| Colmer | Jonas | Selden |
| Conable | Keith | Shipley |
| Conte | Kirwan | Shriver |
| Craley | Kornegay | Sikes |
| Cramer | Kunkel | Skubitz |
| Cunningham | Laird | Smith, Iowa |
| Curtin | Landrum | Smith, Va. |
| Curtis | Langen | Stafford |
| Dague | Latta | Stalbaum |
| Davis, Ga. | Long, La. | Stanton |
| Davis, Wis. | Long, Md. | Steed |
| de la Garza | McClory | Stubblefield |
| Denton | McCulloch | Sullivan |
| Devine | McDade | Talcott |
| Dole | McFall | Taylor |
| Dorn | McMillan | Teague, Tex. |
| Dowdy | MacGregor | Thomas |
| Downing | Machen | Thompson, La. |
| Duncan, Oreg. | Mackie | Thompson, Tex. |
| Duncan, Tenn. | Mahon | Thomson, Wis. |
| Edmondson | Mailliard | Todd |
| Edwards, Ala. | Marsh | Trimble |
| Everett | Martin, Ala. | Tuck |
| Evins, Tenn. | Martin, Nebr. | Tuten |
| Farnum | Matthews | Udall |
| Fascell | May | Vanik |
| Feighan | Miller | Vigorito |
| Findley | Mills | Vivian |
| Fisher | Mink | Walker, Miss. |
| Flood | Minshall | Walker, N. Mex. |
| Flynt | Mize | Watkins |
| Fogarty | Monagan | Weltner |
| Ford, Gerald R. | Moore | Whalley |
| Ford, | Morris | White, Tex. |
| William D. | Morse | Whitener |
| Fountain | Morton | Whitten |
| Friedel | Mosher | Williams |
| Fuqua | Murray | Willis |
| Gathings | Natcher | Wilson, Bob |
| Gettys | Nelsen | Wyatt |
| Gonzalez | O'Hara, Mich. | Younger |
| Goodell | O'Konski | |

NOT VOTING—61

| | | |
|---------------|--------------|----------------|
| Addabbo | Gialmo | Nix |
| Ashbrook | Gibbons | O'Brien |
| Blatnik | Green, Oreg. | Olson, Minn. |
| Boggs | Halpern | Redlin |
| Brock | Hanna | Resnick |
| Broyhill, Va. | Hardy | Rivers, Alaska |
| Clark | Harris | St. Onge |
| Conyers | Hawkins | Schisler |
| Corman | Hébert | Scott |
| Culver | Holland | Senner |
| Daddario | Jarman | Springer |
| Dawson | Jones, Ala. | Staggers |
| Dickinson | Jones, Mo. | Stephens |
| Diggs | Leggett | Toil |
| Dingell | Lennon | Tupper |
| Dow | Lindsay | Van Deerlin |
| Dulski | Mackay | Waggonner |
| Evans, Colo. | Madden | White, Idaho |
| Fallon | Mathias | Young |
| Farnsley | Moeller | |
| Garmatz | Morrison | |

So the preferential motion was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Gialmo for, with Mr. Hébert against.
Mr. Dulski for, with Mr. Stephens against.

Mr. Leggett for, with Mr. Morrison against.
Mr. Toll for, with Mr. Waggonner against.
Mr. Addabbo for, with Mr. Holland against.
Mr. Lindsay for, with Mr. Garmatz against.
Mr. Halpern for, with Mr. Fallon against.
Mr. Dow for, with Mr. Brock against.
Mr. O'Brien for, with Mr. Hardy against.
Mr. Daddario for, with Mr. Lennon against.
Mr. Nix for, with Mr. Scott against.
Mr. Dawson for, with Mr. Dickinson against.
Mr. Dingell for, with Mr. Ashbrook against.
Mr. Diggs for, with Mr. Broyhill of Virginia against.
Mr. Resnick for, with Mr. Young against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Culver with Mr. Springer.
Mr. Conyers with Mr. Tupper.
Mr. Boggs with Mr. Mathias.
Mr. Blatnik with Mr. Hawkins.
Mr. Harris with Mr. St. Onge.
Mr. Schisler with Mr. Madden.
Mr. Staggers with Mr. White of Idaho.
Mr. Biggins with Mrs. Green of Oregon.
Mr. Hanna with Mr. Redlin.
Mr. Moeller with Mr. Mackay.
Mr. Olson of Minnesota with Mr. Van Deerlin.
Mr. Jarman with Mr. Clark.
Mr. Corman with Mr. Senner.
Mr. Farnsley with Mr. Evans of Colorado.

Mr. BOB WILSON changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. CLEVELAND changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON].

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 10: On page 7, line 14, insert:

"FEDERAL-STATE TRAINING PROGRAMS

"For matching grants to States for authorized training and related activities, and for expenses of providing technical assistance to State and local governmental or public bodies (including studies and publication of information), as authorized by title VIII of the Housing Act of 1964 (20 U.S.C. 801-805), \$5,050,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That not to exceed \$50,000 of this appropriation shall be available for administrative expenses."

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. MAHON moves that the House insist upon its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 10.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 11: Page 8, line 1, insert:

"FELLOWSHIPS FOR CITY PLANNING AND URBAN STUDIES

"For fellowships for city planning and urban studies as authorized by section 810 of the Housing Act of 1964 (20 U.S.C. 811), \$515,000: *Provided*, That not to exceed \$15,000 of this appropriation shall be available for administrative expenses."

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. MAHON moves that the House insist upon disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 11.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 15: Page 9, line 7, insert:

"VETERANS REOPENED INSURANCE FUND

"All premiums and collections on insurance issued pursuant to section 725 of title 38, United States Code, shall be credited to the 'Veterans reopened insurance fund', established pursuant to that section, and all payments on such insurance and on any total disability provisions attached thereto shall be made from that fund, notwithstanding any provisions of that section: *Provided*, That for actuarial and accounting purposes, the assets and liabilities (including liability for repayment of advances hereinafter authorized and adjustment of premiums) attributable to each insured group established under said section 725 shall be separately determined: *Provided further*, That such amounts of the 'Veterans special term insurance fund' as may hereafter be determined by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to be in excess of the actuarial liabilities of that fund, including contingency reserves, shall be available for transfer to the 'Veterans reopened insurance fund' as needed to provide initial capital: *Provided further*, That any amounts so transferred shall be repaid to the Treasury and shall bear interest payable to the Treasury at rates established in accordance with section 725(d)(1) of title 38, United States Code."

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. MAHON moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 15 and concur therein.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, this is one of the motions of the committee which is somewhat controversial. I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SAYLOR].

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I respectfully urge that you vote down the motion of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON]. Only a few moments ago you heard my distinguished colleague say that the issue involved then was whether or not the Congress "would get into bed with an agency of the executive branch which has defied the legislative branch of the Government." That is exactly the issue here before us. If you vote to sustain the committee you are doing just that.

Let me give you the history of what has happened. Last year the Congress voted to open the GI insurance program under very limited terms. In that bill authorization was given the Veterans' Administration to ask for appropriations to carry on the work required. The VA officials appeared before the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs in February of this year to give us a report on how they were proceeding with carrying out the authority given to the agency. They told us absolutely nothing of the procedure proposed to finance it except that

they intended to operate in the same manner we had specified in our legislation.

Then, without saying a word to the staff of the Veterans' Affairs Committee, without saying a word to the distinguished chairman of the Veterans' Affairs Committee, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. TEAGUE], or to any other member of the Veterans' Affairs Committee, they went to the Appropriations Committee and asked them to write in language which would completely change the manner in which this bill was to be financed.

I made a point of order against that language when the bill was before us the first time. That point of order was sustained.

As soon as the point of order was sustained I immediately wrote to the Senator, JOHN O. PASTORE, who is the chairman of the Senate subcommittee handling this bill, and explained to him why I had done this, and pointed out this action had the complete support of all members of the Veterans' Affairs Committee. I asked that it not be put back in the bill.

My letter was as follows:

U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON VETERAN AFFAIRS,
Washington, D.C., April 8, 1965.

Hon. JOHN O. PASTORE,
U.S. Senate, Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: Thank you for the opportunity to express my position in connection with the rider relating to the veterans' insurance program which was contained in the second supplemental appropriations, H.R. 7090, in the form in which it was reported by the Committee on Appropriations.

Your attention is invited to page 7131 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of April 6, on which I made a point of order against this language, a violation of the rules, which point of order was sustained.

It is my understanding that the Veterans' Administration still desires to have authority of this nature. It seems to me the transfer of any funds from a trust fund for purposes not contemplated when the trust fund was established, is a highly questionable procedure. It certainly is not countenanced in the business community, and I doubt the wisdom of the Veterans' Administration proceeding in this fashion.

I feel very strongly that the legislative committee, in this case, our own Veterans' Affairs Committee, should have been consulted on this point and prior approval obtained.

The simplest procedure, it seems to me, is for a direct appropriation to be made for this administrative service. The appropriation is quite warranted and will be repaid promptly as the premiums on the reopened insurance are received.

I have advised Mr. Brickfield and his associates, while I am sympathetic and fully understand the position in which they find themselves, if the Senate in its wisdom should include this language, I would feel duty bound to object to it when it came before the House at the time of the presentation of the conference report.

I appreciate the opportunity to make clear my position on this subject.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN P. SAYLOR,
Member of Congress.

Despite that fact, the Senate subcommittee inserted the language in the bill, and because of the fact that it is now

brought up in the manner it is, I cannot make a point of order that it is legislation on this bill.

I have, however, sent a letter to the subcommittee chairman, ALBERT THOMAS, under date of April 28, 1965, and would like to have it inserted as part of my remarks:

U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS,
Washington, D.C., April 28, 1965.

Hon. ALBERT THOMAS,
Member of Congress,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I am writing to you in your capacity as chairman of the subcommittee which handles the second supplemental appropriations bill H.R. 7091, because of the role which you and your associates will, I assume, play when this measure goes to conference.

I am disturbed to learn from reading the Senate reported version that the language permits the Veterans' Administration to transfer money from an insurance fund to meet the operating expenses authorized by appropriate sections of Public Law 88-664. You will recall that on April 6, 1965, I made a point of order against this identical language, which point of order was sustained by the Chair. On page 7131 of the RECORD of that date, I indicated to some small degree the reasons for my action.

Inherent in the entire history of this legislation as well as specifically in several sections of Public Law 88-664, is the authority to make appropriations necessary for the administration of this reopening. As you will recall, this entire insurance section was added to the non-service-connected pension bill, H.R. 1927, and in adding this section the Senate Committee on Finance in its report (S. Rept. 1591, 88th Cong.), made this statement: "There will be, however, an initial administrative outlay to the Veterans' Administration estimated at \$6,580,000 for the first year, \$4,408,500 for the second year, \$2,989,750 for the third year, \$2,945,000 for the fourth year, and \$2,867,250 for the fifth year. In reality, this is a bookkeeping transaction involving no cost to the Government inasmuch as the bill provides that funds 'so appropriated' shall be repaid to the Treasury by collection of the administrative expenses from the policyholders."

I have supplied the emphasis in the aforementioned quotation to indicate that the authority of this legislation clearly shows that the administrative expenses inherently necessary in this reopening program would be appropriated from the Treasury and repaid by the policyholders who take advantage of this new law which is effective May 1. At no time during the hearings or consideration of this measure in the Senate or any time subsequent to the enactment of this law has the Congress been officially advised other than by the language of the supplemental appropriation, H.R. 7091, that it was contemplated to enact legislation through these means or otherwise, to permit the transfer of moneys from this trust fund for administrative purposes.

On February 17, the Deputy Administrator, Mr. Brickfield testified before the Subcommittee on Insurance of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, at what was supposed to have been a hearing calling for full and complete disclosure of all facets of the reopening of the program of National Service Life Insurance. At no time during the hearing did Mr. Brickfield or any of his associates in any way indicate that legislation to permit such a transfer was needed or contemplated. On page 51 of these hearings, Mr. Brickfield states, "The initial working capital will be obtained by making a loan from the Treasury which will be repaid with interest as premium and other income be-

comes available." It would seem that if legislation were needed, full disclosure to the Congress would require that it take place in that hearing and Mr. Brickfield would have advised the subcommittee to this effect. Such advice was not forthcoming and the most charitable consideration which can be placed upon the Veterans' Administration action in this field is one of deviousness and a desire to be less than frank.

Subsequent to the House passage of 7901, I communicated the background of this question to the Senator from Rhode Island, Mr. PASTORE, who was in charge of this legislation in the Senate and expressed the desire that the Senate committee would follow regular standards in this matter by use of the legislative committee rather than resorting to a rider as has been done. Unfortunately, the Senate has seen fit to restore the language in question to the appropriation bill. On April 13, an executive session was held of the Subcommittee on Insurance of the Veterans' Affairs Committee and Mr. Brickfield and his associates from the Veterans' Administration appeared. Although not a member of the subcommittee, I also was asked to appear. It was learned during the course of this executive session that as long ago as last November the decision to proceed in this fashion to bypass the Committee on Veterans' Affairs had been made by the Bureau of the Budget with the full knowledge and acquiescence by the Veterans' Administration. This was at the time of the preparation of the 1966 budget. Mr. Brickfield and his associates were advised by all members of the subcommittee who were in attendance at this executive session to at once request the necessary funds by the regular appropriation route and they were also given assurance that the subcommittee members would do what they could to see that this was granted. For reasons unknown to me, the Bureau of the Budget refused to permit the Veterans' Administration to proceed in this fashion.

At this same executive session, the Veterans' Administration representatives were advised that if an appropriation could not be obtained for this purpose, that legislation to permit a transfer of funds would be introduced and carefully considered by the subcommittee. I have now introduced H.R. 7597, which accomplishes this purpose and is now pending before the Committee on Veterans' Affairs. It is my understanding that the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. EVERETT], the chairman of the Subcommittee on Insurance, would have introduced identical legislation at the same time had he not been absent because of illness.

I am hopeful that this legislation can be speedily considered by the subcommittee, that a hearing be held on this specific bill, at which time this entire unfortunate affair can be laid bare. I am sure that the Subcommittee on Insurance as well as the full Committee on Veterans' Affairs will act promptly on this matter and in a responsible fashion.

I am sure that you would not for one moment be a party to the Veterans' Administration flouting the wishes or evading the responsibility or authority of a committee of the Congress and yet that is what the Veterans' Administration has sought to evade, a proper accounting to the committee which is charged with the legislative oversight of this agency.

The comptroller of the Veterans' Administration made it clear to the members of the subcommittee in executive session on April 13 that if this rider should not be approved, other funds would be transferred to provide for the necessary administrative funds for the reopening of this national service life insurance program. I stress this point to indicate that there will be no delay and no inconvenience to the veterans who are eligible for this type of insurance.

I hope that it will be possible for the Committee on Veterans' Affairs to act on this legislation before H.R. 7091 leaves the conference stage but in any event I ask your support in resisting the efforts of the managers of the bill in the other body to include this legislative language in the final version of the appropriation bill, H.R. 7091.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN P. SAYLOR,
Member of Congress.

The representatives of the Veterans' Administration have now been before the Veterans' Affairs Committee. They have told us they do not need this language now, and have further informed us that they do not need the money now.

We asked what they needed. They drafted a bill and brought it to our committee. I have introduced H.R. 7597 which establishes the veterans reopened insurance fund, and wish to include it in entirety at this point of my remarks:

H.R. 7597

A bill to establish the Veterans Reopened Insurance Fund in the Treasury and to authorize initial capital to operate insurance and programs under title 38, United States Code, section 725

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, effective May 1, 1965, section 725 of title 38, United States Code, is amended as follows:

(1) By placing a period after the word "basis" in clause (8) of subsection (b) and striking all of the remainder of such clause.

(2) By substituting a period for the semicolon at the end of clause (7) of subsection (c) and striking all of the remainder of the subsection.

(3) By amending subsection (d)(1) to read as follows:

"(d)(1) All premiums and collections on insurance issued pursuant to this section and any total disability income provision attached thereto shall be credited to the Veterans Reopened Insurance Fund, a revolving fund established in the Treasury of the United States, and all payments on such insurance and any total disability provision attached thereto shall be made from that fund. For actuarial and accounting purposes, the assets and liabilities (including liabilities for repayment of advances herein-after authorized, and adjustment of premiums) attributable to the insured groups established under this section shall be separately determined. Such amounts in the Veterans Special Term Insurance Fund in the Treasury as may hereafter be determined by the Administrator to be in excess of the actuarial liabilities of that fund, including contingency reserves, shall be available for transfer to the Veterans Reopened Insurance Fund as needed to provide initial capital. Any amounts so transferred shall be repaid to the Treasury over a reasonable period of time with interest as determined by the Secretary of the Treasury taking into consideration the average yield on all marketable interest-bearing obligations of the United States of comparable maturities then forming a part of the public debt."

(4) By striking the words "subsection (b) of" wherever they appear in subsection (d)(2).

(5) By striking the following words from subsection (d)(3): "or the National Service Life Insurance appropriation, as appropriate."

The distinguished gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. EVERETT], who is the chairman of the Insurance Subcommittee called a special committee meeting this morning. We held hearings and

heard the representatives of the Bureau of the Budget and the Veterans' Administration. We reported this bill out unanimously. I urge the House, if they believe what the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON] has said, namely, that the integrity of the House is involved and that we should not get into bed with an agency downtown that has defied the legislative branch of the Government, then you should vote down his motion.

Another thing I would like to call your attention to is the language meddles with trust funds. One of the important things you have to remember is that a trust fund is a rather sacred thing. It is set up for a special purpose.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman one additional minute.

Mr. SAYLOR. This trust fund that has been set up, that they now propose to transfer under the language in this bill, is not for the purpose they are trying to use it for now. If we have any financial integrity, if we as Members of Congress believe that trust funds are sacred funds and should be used only for the purposes for which they are created, then we should not meddle with this trust fund. I sincerely hope that you will support the members of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs and vote down this motion.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. EVERETT].

Mr. EVERETT. Mr. Speaker, there are just a few times that I have come to this floor to make any kind of remarks, but I am here today to protect the integrity of our distinguished chairman, the gentleman from Texas, the Honorable OLIN TEAGUE, and the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

Last November 1964, when the budget was in preparation, a decision was made to try this route of transferring, from an insurance revolving fund, money to provide for the administrative expenses of the reopening of national service life insurance on May 1, and to accomplish this by means of legislation on an appropriation bill. We did not know a thing in the world about it. The distinguished gentlemen from Texas [Mr. MAHON and Mr. THOMAS] have been in charge of this. Our distinguished chairman, the Honorable OLIN TEAGUE, has fought them on many occasions—not once but five or six times—protecting the Veterans' Administration and securing through the acts of this House millions of dollars to repair hospitals and to spend more millions of dollars to renovate old hospitals and construct new ones. At the present time we are working very hard to save a lot of the veterans' hospitals that the bureaucrats downtown want to close. So, my friends, when they brought this to our attention, we asked the appropriate Veterans' Administration officials why they chose this route after the point of order had been made by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SAYLOR] on April 6, 1965, and sustained. They did not heed the Veterans' Affairs Committee; they

went on over to the other body. And what did they do there? They got it put on, and now they bring it back to us. They say, "Oh, we were wrong about coming before this committee, but we want this passed because time is of the essence." They can live for 2 or 3 months without these funds. The minute we heard about it we introduced a bill—I and Mr. SAYLOR did—and the Subcommittee on Insurance met this morning and voted this measure out with full assurance from the chairman of the full committee that he will call a meeting soon, perhaps next week, to give the necessary authorization.

If you wish to protect the integrity of this House and protect us and all of the other legislative committees, I certainly want you to vote to agree with Mr. SAYLOR and Mr. TEAGUE, who will follow me in a few minutes.

I thank you.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ADAIR].

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, we on the Committee on Veterans' Affairs have tried through the years to act responsively with respect to veterans programs. Members of the House know that there have been a number of highly controversial programs proposed, and it has been our purpose and our effort to try to do the things which we believe are in the best interests of the House, the veterans, and the people of the United States generally. I feel strongly that the position taken by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SAYLOR] and the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. EVERETT], which is the position of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, ought to be sustained. I urge that the Members so vote.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. TEAGUE], the chairman of the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I am sure that all Members of the House realize that we are not being critical of the Committee on Appropriations, but we do have a good committee that works very hard, as does the Insurance Subcommittee under the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. EVERETT]. He has done a good job, as good a job as any subcommittee can do. I question that any committee of Congress is more responsive to any agency than we are to the Veterans' Administration. But I very much resent the fact that they did not even approach the legislative committee, but went to the Committee on Appropriations and asked for money which had not been authorized.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON] will be voted down.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, the House and the country are under heavy obligation to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs. That committee does a fine job for our veterans and the Nation and I want to pay tribute to it. The question involved here is whether we make a direct appropriation from the Treasury or handle it through a transfer from a so-called trust fund. Certainly there is no desire on the part of the Committee

on Appropriations to clash with members of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs. We are all working for the same people. I can understand some of the resentment which they feel against the Veterans' Administration for failing to make proper contact with the Committee on Veterans' Affairs. There must have been some misunderstanding. Certainly this important committee should have been fully consulted in the matter. However, we are now confronted with the proposition of what to do about this situation.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS] who handles these matters in the subcommittee for the independent offices bill.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I regret that a misunderstanding has developed between, not the Committee on Appropriations and our distinguished friends on the legislative committee, but between the legislative committee and the Veterans' Administration officials downtown. Sometimes I wonder how awkward some of the Bureau people can get. Of all the hard working, efficient and distinguished legislative committees in this House I know of none that does a more efficient job or a better job, or has the interest of the veteran at heart more than this great committee of the House composed of our distinguished friends over here on my left and on my right. They are all my close personal friends.

I do hope that the Veterans' Administration officials will come over and make their peace with this committee. They cannot operate without them. You know it and I know it. They carry the load. This subcommittee and the Committee on Appropriations are nothing but waterboys for this legislative committee. We are delighted and happy and honored to serve them in that capacity.

Bear in mind, Mr. Speaker, that your subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations does not have but just 50 percent of the authority—not all of the authority.

Mr. Speaker, we have an equal and coordinate body over at the other end of the Capitol and, of course, it is made up of great people also. But I suppose we have to brag on ourselves a little bit. They are not the greatest. However, they are equally important. Unfortunately, though, we have to listen to them every now and then because they have a vote also.

Now, Mr. Speaker, let me review what happened.

Mr. EVERETT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMAS. Why, surely I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. EVERETT. Will not the gentleman from Texas admit that if we had listened to the other body over there what in the world would the national debt be today? Would the gentleman answer that question?

Mr. THOMAS. I will say to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. EVERETT] that I did not go to school that long.

Mr. EVERETT. If the gentleman will yield further, no one has worked any

harder throughout the years during which he has served here in the Congress in protecting the rights of this House time and time again and in holding down expenditures when the other body loaded the bill time and time again with them and the gentleman has come back and he has used the butcher knife on them very effectively, has he not?

Mr. THOMAS. Well, we have tried, we have tried. I thank you for your contribution. We all love you and respect you.

Mr. Speaker, let us see what is involved here. I believe our chairman, the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON], explained it very well. Outside of the personal controversy—and I do hope they can make it up, and if the VA officials downtown are smart, they had better make it up before the sun goes down—we are talking about \$5.5 million, gentlemen, to take care of three insurance programs, to pay the premiums on those programs. These premiums are coming due now. Incidentally, the three programs came into existence through the only route by which they can become established and that is by law and this was because our beloved and efficient Committee on Veterans' Affairs sponsored them and urged the House of Representatives to approve them.

So, Mr. Speaker, in one sense of the word every key in the legislative process has been fully respected. Every "i" in the legislative process has been dotted. In other words, the three programs about which we are talking now were put forward and the House passed them by virtue of the high standing which these gentlemen who serve on the Committee on Veterans' Affairs enjoy. So what is involved really is a little question of money.

Now, Mr. Speaker, why was the point of order raised against it and why was it sustained, since they had already passed on the three programs and approved them legislatively? The reason is because there was no freshly appropriated money contained in the bill for that purpose. In other words, we were not taking from the taxpayers the \$5.5 million contained in the bill. The Veterans' Administration had that amount of money in a trust fund and they merely wanted to transfer it and spend it for this purpose. Therefore, what is the alternative? This has got to be paid. These premiums are coming due. These gentlemen will have to come back and request what? A supplemental. If they do come back and request it, they are going to get it, and you know it and I know it.

Mr. EVERETT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMAS. I am delighted to yield further to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. EVERETT. This morning we passed a bill giving them the authority, the proper authorizing authority, to do that and to come back and get the approval of this distinguished committee. Now, what we are trying to do is to break these agencies and all of these departments and bureaus downtown

from just completely ignoring the will of this House of Representatives as well as the will of the other body.

Mr. THOMAS. No one can fall out with the gentleman for that purpose; I cannot, I will tell the gentleman that.

Mr. EVERETT. If the gentleman will yield further, the gentleman enjoys serving on the Committee on Appropriations just as I enjoy serving on the Committee on Veterans' Affairs. But I surely hate to be ignored in the manner in which they have ignored the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

Mr. THOMAS. The gentleman does a tremendous job and if they are halfway smart, they will not ignore the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, if the Members of the House want to wait 60 or 90 days—I suppose we will be here anywhere from 30 to 60 to 90 days, who knows—they will have to come back and you will have to take from the taxpayer's pocket an additional \$5.5 million.

As the matter now stands, and the way the Senate has put it in there, they can use the funds they already have. What you are doing is this: You are going to increase the debt another \$5.5 million. It is that simple.

I have no quarrel with my distinguished friends. They do so much for the veterans. They do such a fine job that I cannot quarrel with them. But I think every legislative "i" has been dotted and every "t" crossed. The reason it was subject to a point of order is because it dealt with funds not in the bill, but appropriated in prior years.

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMAS. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. TEAGUE of California. I happen to serve on the subcommittee that dealt with this problem. My understanding is this money which was proposed to be transferred would otherwise go back to the Treasury. This is not costing or saving the taxpayers any money, one way or the other. But I do suggest we all bear in mind if we sustain the position of the House this is not going to affect in any detrimental way any veteran in this country. The program should be reinstated.

Mr. THOMAS. I did not intend to intimate it was, because I know those programs are going to be paid, and your great committee will see to that, and we will cooperate with you.

Mr. TEAGUE of California. The membership understands it is not a pro or anti-veteran proposition, but as I see it a case of sustaining the position of the House and following our regular legislative procedure.

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMAS. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. AYRES. I have been a member of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs under the chairmanship of three different members. For the length of time that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. TEAGUE] has been chairman, we have had a very close and friendly relationship with the Veterans' Administration.

I was surprised in the last 6 months to see that there has been somewhat of a change. A concrete example of this happened a few months ago when the Veterans' Administration through the public press made an announcement they were going to close certain regional offices and hospitals. The chairman of the committee and myself were notified of the decision that they had made. They have had ample opportunity to come before the committee on this issue and ask for the proper authorization. Today we have an opportunity to cast a vote to show the Veterans' Administration that the Committee on Veterans' Affairs is capable, willing, and able as soon as they come before us. To date they have not done that.

Mr. THOMAS. Did not your committee really pass on these insurance programs? You brought them to the floor of the House and asked the Congress to write them and make them law, and by virtue of your recommendations to the House, the House followed your suggestion. So really, in truth and in fact, the "t's" have been crossed, and the "i's" have been dotted. What we were talking about is purely a matter of form.

Mr. AYRES. No. We are talking about the amount of money.

Mr. THOMAS. I am not going to fuss with my friend, because we love him, and he has done a fine job for the VA.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. MAHON) there were—ayes, 45, nays, 93.

So the motion was rejected.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House insist on its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 15.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 26: Page 16, line 13, insert "together with such amount as may be necessary to be charged to the subsequent year appropriation for benefit payments for any period subsequent to May 31 of the year."

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. MAHON moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 26 and concur therein.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 27: Page 17, line 10, insert the following:

"SALARIES AND EXPENSES

"Amounts available for any activity under appropriations under this head in the Department of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare Appropriation Act, 1965, shall also be available for any other activity there-

under to the extent needed in preparing for and carrying out the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965."

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. MAHON moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 27 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed, insert the following:

"SALARIES AND EXPENSES

"Amounts available for any activity under appropriations under this head in the Department of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare Appropriation Act, 1965, shall also be available for any other activity thereunder to the extent needed in preparing for the programs authorized by the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965."

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 28: Page 17, line 17, insert the following:

"PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

"Water supply and water pollution control

"Not to exceed \$820,000 of the amount appropriated under this head in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare Appropriation Act, 1965, shall remain available until June 30, 1966, for construction projects to demonstrate control and abatement of acid mine drainage."

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. MAHON moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 28 and concur therein.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 29: Page 18, line 4, insert the following:

"SOCIAL SECURITY ADMINISTRATION

"Limitation on salaries and expenses

"Amounts available for any activity under appropriations under this head in the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare Appropriation Act, 1965, shall also be available for any other activity thereunder to the extent needed in preparing for and carrying out the Social Security Amendments of 1965."

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. MAHON moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 29 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed, insert the following:

"SOCIAL SECURITY ADMINISTRATION

"Limitation on salaries and expenses

"Amounts available for any activity under appropriations under this head in the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare Appropriation Act, 1965, shall also be available for any other activity thereunder to the extent needed in preparing for the programs authorized by the social security amendments of 1965."

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 30: On page 19, line 11, insert:

"SENATE

"For payment to Gladys A. Johnston, widow of Olin D. Johnston, late a Senator from the State of South Carolina, \$30,000."

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. MAHON moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 30 and concur therein.

The motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider the votes by which action was taken on the several motions was laid on the table.

GENERAL PERMISSION TO REVISE AND EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who have spoken on the conference report may revise and extend their remarks.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to include certain tables relating to the conference report which has been adopted.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

AMENDING NATIONAL ARTS AND CULTURAL DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 1964

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up the resolution (H. Res. 325) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 325

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 4714) to amend the National Arts and Cultural Development Act of 1964 with respect to the authorization of appropriations therein. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed one hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Education and Labor, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. QUILLEN]; and pending that, to myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, this is a rule to make in order a bill to correct an error that was made in Public Law 88-579, which establishes the National Council on the Arts. The clear intent of the act was to establish the Council on a continuing

basis. But language was left out so there is a limitation on the appropriation for only 1 year. This obviously is not the intent of the Congress. The purpose of this resolution and bill which will be taken up pursuant to the resolution is to clear up this legislative error.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. QUILLIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Missouri has adequately explained the purposes of the bill. I would like to point out, however, as I understand it, the bill was objected to previously under suspension and now it is up under a rule.

Mr. Speaker, I have no requests for time and yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 4714) to amend the National Arts and Cultural Development Act of 1964 with respect to the authorization of appropriations therein.

The motion was agreed to.

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 4714, with Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. THOMPSON] will be recognized for 30 minutes and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. AYRES], will be recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Chairman, last year, culminating almost 90 years of effort, the Congress gave national recognition to the arts by the enactment of Public Law 88-579. This act, the National Cultural Development Act of 1964, created a National Council on the Arts, to be composed of a Chairman and 24 members, plus the Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution, ex officio.

The Chairman of the Council is a full-time employee, appointed for a 6-year term. His salary is established, at \$21,000 a year. During a term—he may not succeed himself—he will be paid a total of \$126,000.

The Council, by law, must meet at least twice a year. When actually working, we authorize the standard per diem

allowance for Council members, plus travel and subsistence payments. Council members serve for 6 years, staggered terms. During the tenure of one Chairman, the Council must meet at least 12 times. The cost of a meeting of the Council is about \$3,500. Thus for the tenure of one Chairman, the statutory meetings of the Council, would cost \$84,000, in total.

The act assigns a number of functions to the Council, including special studies, the appointment of panels of experts, and so forth. Special studies could be contracted out. The panels of experts would be paid in accord with existing laws and regulations for the use of such personnel.

During the debate on the bill last year, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. THOMPSON], suggested that the Chairman would need four permanent employees in his office. Obviously he will need stationery, telephone service, office space, travel funds, and so forth.

But if we count only the salary of the Chairman, and the estimated cost of the statutory meetings of the Council for one 6-year term, the sums required would amount to \$200,000.

When the bill was reported to the House last year, section 10 authorized "such sums as may be necessary" for the expenses of the Council. During the debate the question of an authorized ceiling was discussed, and the majority accepted an amendment offered by the then ranking minority member, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN], setting a ceiling of \$150,000.

The inclusions of the words "per annum" was overlooked. At this time, the Appropriations Committee may not provide more than \$150,000 for the lifetime of a permanent Council, whose expenses for just the Chairman's salary and for the statutory meetings, will exceed that sum during the 6-year tenure of the first Chairman.

The bill before us today corrects that error, and makes it possible to carry out the intent of the Congress.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, the bill H.R. 4714 is a short bill, making a simple two-word amendment to the National Cultural Development Act of 1964. It adds the words "per annum" to section 10 of that act. It has the effect of authorizing annual appropriations for the National Council on the Arts, of not to exceed \$150,000.

Due to a technical error, the House, in adopting an amendment which placed a ceiling on appropriations, omitted the words "per annum." It was clearly the intent that appropriations would be authorized on an annual basis.

As the report accompanying this bill sets forth, the Council is a permanent body. We create a Chairman who is specifically authorized to receive \$21,000 per annum, and who is appointed for a 6-year term.

Unless we adopt this amendment, the Council may be funded at no more than \$150,000 for its lifetime. It was granted \$50,000 for the current fiscal year. In the absence of an annual authorization,

the House has allowed but \$50,000 for fiscal year 1966. The President, in his budget, included a request for \$150,000 for the Council for fiscal year 1966.

I urge approval of the bill.

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise in support of the bill, H.R. 4714. I believe my distinguished colleague, the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. THOMPSON], expressed the point clearly. This is essentially a technical amendment, merely adding the words "per annum".

It represents, in my judgment, the clear intent of what was meant in the passage of the National Arts and Cultural Development Act of 1964.

I might add that I have talked with my colleague, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN], the former ranking minority member of the Committee on Education and Labor, who offered the amendment which limited the authorization to \$150,000, and he told me it was his intent and his understanding at the time that "per annum" was implicit and that it was merely a technical oversight when it was not included. I do not know whether the gentleman from New Jersey is on the floor at present or whether he would wish to add to that, but I believe his intent was clear.

Accordingly, Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the bill and I hope it will be promptly passed with bipartisan support. The legislation which we enacted into law in the 88th Congress—establishing the National Council on the Arts—was an important first step in recognizing the arts at the national level and will—I believe—encourage the growth and development of the arts throughout the United States.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. KREBS].

Mr. KREBS. Mr. Chairman, had I been a Member of this House when it enacted the National Arts and Cultural Development Act of 1964, I would have voted for it. Today I am offered a second-best opportunity which I accept. I, therefore, rise in strong support for H.R. 4714 which will clarify the intent of annual appropriations not to exceed \$150,000.

It is entirely fitting that this bill be passed as we seek to extend the great American society throughout not only the huge urban centers that have traditionally been able to support their performing arts, but through the smaller communities that have tasted the greatness of our American culture but which somehow have not been able to alone maintain and nurture aspiring American artists.

From time to time one hears condescending attitudes from abroad about the lack of American capacity to maintain its artists, and, in fact, the number of artists who feel compelled to study and perform in foreign countries tends to lend credence to those critics.

Americans want and do support efforts to encourage and promote the arts at every level of government. Last year's

passage of the National Arts and Cultural Development Act responded to that mandate. Let us in Congress today respond to a renewal of support for that goal by voting for this technical amendment contained in H.R. 4714.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 4714, a bill to amend the National Arts and Cultural Development Act of 1964 with respect to the authorization of appropriations therein.

My colleagues will recall my longstanding and profound interest in Federal legislation to promote nationwide support for the arts and humanities. In its earlier forms I have recommended this legislation since 1962. This bill, H.R. 4714, would simply correct a technical error in Public Law 88-579 since the clear intent of this act was to establish the National Council on the Arts on an ongoing basis and I urge favorable consideration of the measure.

It is my earnest desire that this legislation under consideration will be but the beginning of much greater expansion in this area and on March 10 of this year it was my privilege and satisfaction to be associated with the gentleman from New Jersey, Congressman THOMPSON, in the introduction of a bill to provide for the establishment of the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities to promote progress and scholarship in the humanities and the arts.

On that same day the President transmitted the administration's recommendations supporting this bill and declaring, in part:

Government can seek to create conditions under which the arts can flourish; through recognition of achievements, through helping those who seek to enlarge creative understanding, through increasing the access of our people to the works of our artists, and through recognizing the arts as part of the pursuit of American greatness. That is the goal of this legislation.

I feel that the President's carefully chosen words express the essential meaning of this historically important legislation.

It is my hope that the Members of the House of Representatives will soon have the opportunity to approve this legislation and I want to take this opportunity to call attention to some of its features:

First. We are dealing here with a force vital to society which cannot sustain itself without help.

Second. The United States must not limit its effort to science and technology but must give full value and support to the other great branches of man's scholarly, literary, and artistic activity.

Third. This bill provides the necessary implementation of the National Council on the Arts which was established by Public Law 88-579—the National Arts and Cultural Development Act of 1964 which is presently under consideration.

Fourth. It provides assurances against Federal interference in scholarship, teaching, research, and artistic endeavors.

Fifth. Community, private, and State support for the arts and humanities will

be increased by this legislation. Some of the States, notably New York, have proved the validity of this assumption through the additional local funds generated as the result of the expenditures of limited State funds by their respective State arts organizations.

Sixth. The bill emphasizes cooperation with existing Federal programs.

Passage of H.R. 4714 today, I believe, will provide the necessary groundwork to get this show on the road.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time unless someone present would like to use it. Mr. Chairman, I merely add my support to the bill. I think the National Council on the Arts should be supported.

The CHAIRMAN. There being no further requests for time, the Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 10 of the National Arts and Cultural Development Act of 1964 is amended by inserting "per annum" after "\$150,000".

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the necessary number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I doubt very much that this was an oversight or a technical error. In any event, the law ought to be retained as it is. As a matter of fact, there is no need for a \$21,000-a-year Director of Cultural Affairs. Up to this point I have been unable to discover anything that this individual or cultural council has accomplished for the thousands of dollars already expended. In March, when this same bill was before the House under suspension of the rules and was defeated on that occasion, we were not able at that time to discover anything that had been accomplished up to that point as far as cultural affairs are concerned except to provide for a few payrollers. Therefore, I would hope that the House would stand by the position many of the Members took in March of this year and put this on an annual review basis as far as the Congress is concerned. I think that the proponents of this legislation, who propose to spend \$150,000 a year on a small number of fat cats to promote alleged cultural affairs, ought to have to come to the floor of the House and justify how the money has been spent. With the rejection of this bill this is what they would have to do. This is apparently what they do not want to have to do, that is, come to the floor of the House and justify how the money has been spent and explain what this council is or, especially, is not doing. So I hope that the House will reject this measure and continue the situation as it presently is. Let them come in and justify it each year.

Mr. Chairman, in view of the enormous debt with which this country is confronted I think of nothing less necessary than a permanent Federal appropriation and the spending of \$150,000 every year for the promotion of so-called cul-

ture when there are so many other drains upon the Treasury.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to give my friend from Iowa a bit of comfort by reassuring him on the question of what the intent of the author of the bill and its proponents was at the time an amendment limiting the appropriation to \$150,000 was adopted last year. It was, I assure my friend from Iowa, our intent that this be on an annual basis. As the manager of that bill at the time, I am somewhat embarrassed now to have to admit my mistake in not noting the omission of the words "per annum." It was then, it is now, and it will continue to be our intent that this be a maximum of \$150,000 per annum. I might remind my friend from Iowa further that this proposition received rather overwhelming support even in March when, even though we failed to receive a full two-thirds vote—the vote, I believe, was 217 to 118 or a margin of 99 votes—indicating a consensus here, I am convinced. I am also convinced of the need for this, and I might reassure my friend from Iowa by reminding him that this council must go before the appropriate subcommittee and before the full Committee on Appropriations each year to make its request and to justify its request.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. I am delighted to yield.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman for yielding. That is exactly the point. We had some experience here this afternoon with the operations of the Committee on Appropriations and its various subcommittees. And so I say that as to a matter of this kind, with an expenditure of \$150,000 a year—I do not know what for and I do not know that anyone can point to anything specifically that has been accomplished for the spending of thousands of dollars thus far—

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I decline to yield further and wish to say only that the maximum is \$150,000 and it has to be justified. I think it is entirely appropriate.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 4714) to amend the National Arts and Cultural Development Act of 1964 with respect to the authorization of appropriations therein, pursuant to House Resolution 325, he reported the bill back to the House.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on passage of the bill.

The question was taken.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 239, nays 116, not voting 78, as follows:

[Roll No. 86]

YEAS—239

| | | |
|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| Adams | Grider | Patten |
| Albert | Griffin | Pelly |
| Andrews, | Griffiths | Pepper |
| N. Dak. | Grover | Perkins |
| Annunzio | Hagen, Calif. | Philbin |
| Ashley | Hamilton | Pickle |
| Aspinall | Hanley | Pike |
| Ayres | Hansen, Iowa | Pirnie |
| Bandstra | Hansen, Wash. | Poage |
| Bates | Hardy | Powell |
| Battin | Harvey, Mich. | Price |
| Beckworth | Hathaway | Pucinski |
| Bingham | Hechler | Purcell |
| Boland | Helstoski | Quile |
| Bolling | Hicks | Race |
| Brademas | Hollifield | Randall |
| Brooks | Horton | Reid, N.Y. |
| Broomfield | Howard | Reifel |
| Brown, Calif. | Hungate | Reuss |
| Burke | Huot | Rhodes, Pa. |
| Burton, Calif. | Ichord | Rivers, Alaska |
| Byrne, Pa. | Irwin | Rivers, S.C. |
| Byrnes, Wis. | Jacobs | Rodino |
| Cahill | Jennings | Rogers, Colo. |
| Callan | Jeolson | Rogers, Fla. |
| Cameron | Johnson, Calif. | Ronan |
| Carey | Johnson, Okla. | Roncalio |
| Carter | Karsten | Rooney, N.Y. |
| Chamberlain | Karth | Rooney, Pa. |
| Chelf | Kastenmeier | Roosevelt |
| Cleveland | Kee | Rosenthal |
| Clevenger | Keith | Rostenkowski |
| Cohelan | King, Calif. | Roush |
| Conable | King, Utah | Roybal |
| Cooley | Krebs | Rumsfeld |
| Corbett | Kunkel | Ryan |
| Craley | Leggett | St Germain |
| Cramer | Long, Md. | Saylor |
| Curtin | Love | Scheuer |
| Daniels | McCarthy | Schmidhauser |
| Davis, Wis. | McClary | Schneebell |
| de la Garza | McDade | Schweiker |
| Dent | McDowell | Sickles |
| Denton | McFall | Sisk |
| Diggs | McGrath | Slack |
| Donohue | McVicker | Smith, Iowa |
| Downing | Macdonald | Smith, N.Y. |
| Duncan, Oreg. | MacGregor | Springer |
| Dwyer | Machen | Stafford |
| Dyal | Mackay | Stalbaum |
| Edmondson | Mahon | Stratton |
| Edwards, Calif. | Mallard | Stubblefield |
| Ellsworth | Marsh | Sullivan |
| Everett | Martin, Mass. | Sweeney |
| Evins, Tenn. | Matsunaga | Teague, Tex. |
| Farbstein | Mathews | Tenzer |
| Fascell | May | Thomas |
| Feighan | Meeds | Thompson, La. |
| Fino | Michel | Thompson, N.J. |
| Flood | Miller | Thompson, Tex. |
| Foley | Minish | Thomson, Wis. |
| Ford, Gerald R. | Mink | Trimble |
| Ford, | Mize | Tunney |
| William D. | Monagan | Udall |
| Fraser | Moorhead | Ullman |
| Frelinghuysen | Morgan | Vanik |
| Fulton, Pa. | Morris | Vigorito |
| Fulton, Tenn. | Morse | Vivian |
| Fuqua | Morton | Walker, N. Mex. |
| Gallagher | Mosher | Watts |
| Gathings | Moss | Weltner |
| Gettys | Multer | Whalley |
| Gilbert | Murphy, Ill. | Willis |
| Gilligan | Murphy, N.Y. | Wolff |
| Gonzalez | Natcher | Wright |
| Goodell | Nedzi | Wyatt |
| Grabowski | O'Hara, Ill. | Wydler |
| Gray | O'Hara, Mich. | Yates |
| Green, Oreg. | Olsen, Mont. | Zablocki |
| Green, Pa. | Ottinger | |
| Greigg | Patman | |

NAYS—116

| | | |
|-----------|----------------|-----------|
| Abbitt | Adair | Andrews, |
| Abernethy | Anderson, Ill. | George W. |

| | | |
|----------------|---------------|----------------|
| Arends | Fisher | Poff |
| Ashmore | Flynt | Pool |
| Baldwin | Fountain | Quillen |
| Baring | Gross | Reid, Ill. |
| Bell | Gubser | Reinecke |
| Bennett | Gurney | Rhodes, Ariz. |
| Berry | Hagan, Ga. | Roberts |
| Betts | Haley | Robison |
| Bolton | Hall | Rogers, Tex. |
| Bonner | Hansen, Idaho | Roudebush |
| Bow | Harsha | Satterfield |
| Bray | Harvey, Ind. | Secrest |
| Brown, Ohio | Henderson | Selden |
| Broyhill, N.C. | Hosmer | Shipley |
| Buchanan | Hull | Shriver |
| Burleson | Hutchinson | Sikes |
| Burton, Utah | Johnson, Pa. | Skubitz |
| Cabell | Jonas | Smith, Calif. |
| Callaway | King, N.Y. | Smith, Va. |
| Casey | Kornegay | Stanton |
| Cederberg | Laird | Steed |
| Clancy | Langen | Talcott |
| Clausen, | Latta | Taylor |
| Don H. | Lipscomb | Teague, Calif. |
| Clawson, Del | Long, La. | Tuck |
| Collier | McCulloch | Tuten |
| Colmer | McEwen | Utt |
| Cunningham | Mackie | Waggonner |
| Curtis | Martin, Ala. | Walker, Miss. |
| Dague | Martin, Nebr. | Watkins |
| Davis, Ga. | Mills | White, Tex. |
| Derwinski | Minshall | Whitener |
| Dole | Moore | Whitten |
| Dorn | Murray | Williams |
| Dowdy | Nelsen | Wilson, Bob |
| Duncan, Tenn. | O'Konski | Younger |
| Edwards, Ala. | O'Neal, Ga. | |
| Erlenborn | Passman | |

NOT VOTING—78

| | | |
|---------------|-------------|----------------|
| Addabbo | Fallon | Lindsay |
| Anderson, | Farnsley | McMillan |
| Tenn. | Farnum | Madden |
| Andrews, | Findley | Mathias |
| Glenn | Fogarty | Moeller |
| Ashbrook | Friedel | Morrison |
| Barrett | Garmatz | Nix |
| Belcher | Gialmo | O'Brien |
| Blatnik | Gibbons | Olson, Minn. |
| Boggs | Halleck | O'Neill, Mass. |
| Brock | Halpern | Redlin |
| Broyhill, Va. | Hanna | Resnick |
| Celler | Harris | St. Onge |
| Clark | Hawkins | Schisler |
| Conte | Hays | Scott |
| Conyers | Hébert | Senner |
| Corman | Herlong | Staggers |
| Culver | Holland | Stephens |
| Daddario | Jarman | Todd |
| Dawson | Jones, Ala. | Toll |
| Delaney | Jones, Mo. | Tupper |
| Devine | Kelly | Van Deerlin |
| Dickinson | Keogh | White, Idaho |
| Dingell | Kirwan | Widnall |
| Dow | Kluczynski | Wilson, |
| Dulski | Landrum | Charles H. |
| Evans, Colo. | Lennon | Young |

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Keogh for, with Mr. Findley against.
 Mr. Fogarty for, with Mr. Devine against.
 Mr. Kirwan for, with Mr. Brock against.
 Mr. Addabbo for, with Mr. Halleck against.
 Mr. Conte for, with Mr. Hébert against.
 Mr. Lindsay for, with Mr. Lennon against.
 Mr. St. Onge for, with Mr. Scott against.
 Mr. Widnall for, with Mr. Ashbrook against.
 Mr. Boggs for, with Mr. Stephens against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Toll with Mr. Andrews of Alabama.
 Mr. Dingell with Mr. Halpern.
 Mr. Barrett with Mr. Belcher.
 Mr. Madden with Mr. Tupper.
 Mr. Morrison with Mr. Mathias.
 Mr. O'Neill of Massachusetts with Mr. Broyhill of Virginia.
 Mr. Gialmo with Mr. Dickinson.
 Mr. Daddario with Mr. Culver.
 Mr. Todd with Mr. McMillan.
 Mr. Moeller with Mr. Nix.
 Mr. Garmatz with Mr. Hanna.
 Mr. Dow with Mr. Landrum.
 Mr. Kluczynski with Mr. Clark.
 Mrs. Kelly with Mr. Holland.
 Mr. Hays with Mr. Schisler.

Mr. Staggers with Mr. Celler.
 Mr. Charles H. Wilson with Mr. Dulski.
 Mr. Conyers with Mr. Resnick.
 Mr. White of Idaho with Mr. Van Deerlin.
 Mr. Senner with Mr. Anderson of Tennessee.

Mr. Harris with Mr. Corman.
 Mr. Fallon with Mr. Farnum.
 Mr. O'Brien with Mr. Gibbons.
 Mr. Young with Mr. Evans of Colorado.
 Mr. Friedel with Mr. Dawson.
 Mr. Olson of Minnesota with Mr. Hawkins.
 Mr. Jarman with Mr. Redlin.
 Mr. Herlong with Mr. Farnsley.

The vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to inquire of the majority leader the program for the remainder of the week and the program for next week.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAIRD. I am happy to yield to the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, in response to the inquiry of the gentleman from Wisconsin, we have completed the legislative program for this week and it will be our intention to ask to go over after the announcement of the program for next week, which is as follows:

Monday is Consent Calendar day.

There are seven suspensions:

H.R. 908, Nez Perce National Historical Park, Idaho;

H.R. 500, providing for the establishment of the Agate Fossil Beds National Monument, Nebr.;

H.R. 6926, improvement and modernization of Government employees' life insurance program;

H.R. 5640, jury commissions for U.S. district courts;

H.R. 5167, amending title 38 of the United States Code to authorize the administrative settlement of tort claims arising in foreign countries, and for other purposes;

H.R. 5184, for the relief of the port of Portland, Oreg.; and

H.R. 5283, inclusion of years of service as judge of the district court for the Territory of Alaska in the computation of years of Federal judicial service for judges of the U.S. District Court for the District of Alaska.

Mr. Speaker, I advise the House that these bills may not be taken up in the order in which they have been announced.

Also on Monday H.R. 2986, the Community Health Services Extension Amendments of 1965, under an open rule with 2 hours of general debate.

Tuesday is Private Calendar Day. Also on Tuesday the 1966 appropriations for Labor and Health, Education, and Welfare. Also on Tuesday H.R. 2985, the Community Mental Health Centers

Act Amendments of 1965, under an open rule with 3 hours of debate. Also on Tuesday H.R. 5401, the Interstate Commerce Act amendments, under an open rule with 3 hours of debate.

On Wednesday H.R. 7657, authorizing defense procurement and research and development.

On Thursday H.R. 7717, authorizing appropriations to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

On Friday and the balance of the week H.R. 2984, the Health Research Facilities Amendments of 1965, under an open rule with 3 hours of debate.

This announcement is made subject to the usual reservation that conference reports may be brought up at any time and that any further program may be announced later.

Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further for the purpose of making some unanimous-consent requests?

Mr. LAIRD. I am glad to yield to the majority leader.

ADJOURNMENT OVER TO MONDAY NEXT

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me for a question?

Mr. LAIRD. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to ask the distinguished majority leader if we can expect early programing of the emergency basin authorization bill which was reported yesterday by the House Committee on Public Works, with regard to which there is a growing emergency in terms of monetary authorizations for contracts?

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, I would say that, of course, when the rule is granted on that bill I think we can assure the gentleman of early programing.

Mr. EDMONDSON. I thank the man very much.

AUTHORIZATION TO RECEIVE MESSAGES AND SIGN BILLS

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding the adjournment of the House until Monday next, the Clerk be authorized to receive messages from the Senate and that the Speaker be authorized to sign any enrolled bills and joint resolutions duly passed by the two Houses and found truly enrolled.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in

order under the Calendar Wednesday rule may be dispensed with on Wednesday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members of the House be given 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks in the RECORD with relation to the bill H.R. 4714.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

ADMINISTRATION'S POLICY IN VIETNAM

Mr. CABELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. CABELL. Mr. Speaker, in these days when a better understanding is so important on the part of the American people concerning the administration's policy in Vietnam, it is gratifying to know that our news media is so diligently trying to keep our Nation informed. I pay tribute especially to the Dallas Morning News, a great newspaper, which has so strongly expressed its support of our President.

At this time, I would like to include in the RECORD an editorial which appeared in the Dallas Morning News on April 21, 1965:

L.B.J.'s DIVIDENDS

Dividends from the President's recent policy speech on Vietnam are coming in. Even if nothing ever comes of the offer of peace with honor, as matters now stand we will have received important cold war gains just by making it.

The speech was not only a combination of sweet talk—which the neutralists like—and strong action—which the Reds understand. It was also an example of Johnson political jujitsu: It threw the Communists off balance at every level from the diplomatic to the tactical.

On the tactical level, the northern Vietnamese officers of the Vietcong are having a tough time trying to get any new recruits in the South. Furthermore, they are losing the ones they have. The United States is accentuating the positive goal of development and it sounds good to many Vietcong troopers, apparently.

On the diplomatic level, it is now the Red North Vietnamese and their Chinese "big daddy" who are telling the neutralist peace-seekers to go jump in the lake and warning the U.N. to mind its own business. While this doesn't affect the military situation, it costs the Reds points among the Afro-Asian nations.

In between, it made necessary an embarrassing switch in the party line of the leftist movements in this country. Heretofore, they had covered their goal of a free world surrender with the reasonable sounding appeal for negotiations. The two terms are synonyms in their book, anyway. Now

they can no longer use "negotiations" as a cover and must campaign more explicitly for a sellout.

All in all, it appears L.B.J. has won an inning in the Reds' own political warfare game.

IMPLICATIONS OF THE PROBLEMS OF VIETNAM

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, because of the urgency of the problem of Vietnam, I would like to discuss the implications from the answers on the Vietnam question in the recent questionnaire which I sent to constituents in the 29th District of California.

There were four policy choices available. These choices, with the percentage favoring each one, are as follows:

| | Percent |
|---|---------|
| 1. Expansion of the war..... | 42 |
| 2. Continue current level, without expansion..... | 12 |
| 3. Seek negotiated settlement..... | 29 |
| 4. Immediate withdrawal..... | 11 |

Six percent did not give a choice or did not answer. Looked at another way, 54 percent favored continuing or expanding our effort, while 40 percent favored negotiating or withdrawing. Still another way of interpreting the results is that 52 percent disagree with the 42 percent who favor expansion.

We have analyzed these total responses in several different ways, and there are significant differences based on political preference, sex, religious preference, age, and education. I should mention, incidentally, that our sample of 13,000 is extremely close to the average of all voters in the district in terms of political affiliation and most other characteristics. It is slightly biased in favor of men, but I suspect that may result from husbands and wives collaborating in some cases and sending in the results under the husband's name. The returns are also biased in favor of the better educated, who, generally, are less afraid of questionnaires.

Broken down by political preference, the results show only 34 percent of the Democrats favoring No. 1, but 54 percent of the Republicans favoring this course. An equal percentage of Democrats—34 percent—favor No. 3, a negotiated settlement, but only 21 percent of the Republicans favor this alternative. About 10 percent of both parties favor the fourth choice—immediate withdrawal.

On the basis of sex, the women are evenly divided on policy, with 46 percent favoring No. 1 and No. 2 and 46 percent favoring No. 3 and No. 4. The men, on the other hand, favor No. 1 and No. 2 by 60 percent, with 37 percent favoring No. 3 and No. 4.

There is no significant difference between Catholic and Protestant responses, but the Jewish and "other" respondents, who represented about 15 percent of the total, were much more strongly in favor

of negotiations—40 percent—and much less in favor of expansion—27 percent.

The distribution of responses based on education was quite interesting, and somewhat difficult to explain. For all of those having less than a high school education—11 years of schooling or less—more supported No. 3 and No. 4 than supported No. 1 and No. 2. For those with 12 years through 16 years of education, which was the largest grouping, opinion was strongly in favor of No. 1 and No. 2. For the "egghead" group—17 through 21 years of schooling—more favored negotiation than expansion. The responses of this group were about the same, in proportion, as the responses of those with less than high school education.

With regard to age, the significant results were that those under 30, who have never experienced war, were much more strongly in favor of continuing or expanding the military action than any other age group. Those 30 and over, whose generation participated in one or more wars, are considerably less enthusiastic.

In a very general way, the profile which emerges from this data is that the citizens of the 29th Congressional District in California are leaning toward a hard-line, expand-the-war policy, led by those who are young, college educated, Republican, and male. Those who are holding back, leaning toward a negotiated settlement, tend to be older, with either more or less education than the hard-line group, Democratic, more predominately female, and of a minority religious belief.

A number of interesting questions are raised as to how I should be guided by results such as these. Which "group" do I seek counsel from? Frankly, I believe that my course should be to decide my stand for myself, based on the best knowledge and judgment I possess. Having done that, I should make my position clear to all, and we should encourage a dialog, a broad exchange of views, to seek to achieve better understanding by all citizens and more reasonable decisions by our Government. We will rarely find that any of us are all right or all wrong. By exchanging views, we may each come a little closer to the truth. Obviously, there is no clear consensus of opinion indicated by the questionnaire results, and a lot of controversy is shown.

It may be anticlimactic for me to indicate, again, that I feel that our country is following the wrong policy in Vietnam.

A TRIBUTE TO THE PEOPLE OF RUSSIAVILLE, IND.

Mr. ROUSH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROUSH. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to pay tribute to the people of the town of Russiaville in my district in Indiana. On Palm Sunday a terrible, devastating storm cut a swath through my

district which destroyed millions of dollars worth of property and claimed scores of lives. The town of Russiaville is a small and unincorporated town. They lost their post office and all of their public facilities, schools, and churches. However, the people of Russiaville are determined people and, despite this loss and despite the fact that they have not been able to determine how they might receive aid from either the State or the Federal Government because of the fact that they are not incorporated, they have banded themselves together with a determination which I think is commendable. I would commend their actions to the people of this country as an exemplification of the American spirit. I would trust that the Members of the House might give these people their moral support as they strive and endeavor to rebuild a community of very fine people.

They already have formed a nonprofit organization and will use the funds being obtained toward gaining legal recognition of their town. They have taken the initial steps which I am certain will lead to a new Russiaville replacing the scars left behind in the devastation of the original.

MAY 3 IN PROUD HISTORY OF POLAND

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, on Monday next all Americans will join with their fellow Americans of Polish birth or descent in celebrating the anniversary of the Polish Constitution of 1791.

May 3, 1965, which is Monday next, will remind us of several significant dates in Polish-American history.

Three hundred and fifty-seven years ago on September 1608, the first Polish settlers landed in Jamestown, Va. The annals of John Smith attest to the fact that these Polish settlers were a most valuable asset to the struggling young colony. They brought their strength, their willingness to work, and their love of freedom to a settlement which needed and welcomed their sturdy qualities.

May 3, 1791, barely 2 years after the adoption of our own Constitution, Poland adopted a Constitution which marks that country as a pioneer of liberalism in Europe. It eliminated with one stroke the fundamental weaknesses of the Polish parliamentary and social system. It proclaimed the sovereignty of the people, a threat to tyranny and absolutism in Russia and Germany.

The Polish Constitution of May 3 proclaimed:

All power in civil society should be derived from the will of the people, its end and object being the preservation and integrity of the State, the civil liberty and the good order of society, on an equal scale and on a lasting foundation.

The year 1966 will mark the one thousandth anniversary of the baptism of the Polish nations. One thousand years ago Poland linked her destiny with that of the west. During a period equal to one-half our Christian era, Poland linked her destiny with that of the west and became an integral and creative force in its culture.

The people of Poland have since the days of Jamestown and through the centuries events to the present furnished the bone and sinew of American Growth. At Jamestown, Poles, cheered and supported John Smith. During the Civil War her soldiers fought on the side of the Union while her daughters nursed our soldiers on the battlefield. Throughout the years these sturdy pioneers of freedom have been a source of strength to the country of their adoption. Today, Polish Americans have set their purpose to the ultimate liberation of their homeland. In their hopes and in the attainment of their prayers all Americans join.

SOIL CONSERVATION SERVICE RE- VOLVING FUND? NO, NO

Mr. ICHORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. ICHORD. Mr. Speaker, the recent recommendation of the Bureau of the Budget for a \$100 million cut in the U.S. Department of Agriculture Soil Conservation Service and to establish a revolving fund for the conservation program is shortsighted planning and is damaging, to say the least, to an effective program which has been one of the most successful ventures of the Federal Government in conserving for the future.

The Soil Conservation Service, initiated in 1929, has without doubt returned dividends amounting to many, many times the original investment of the Government. Created to conserve America's farmland and to protect it from washing, eroding, and devastating windstorms, the Soil Conservation District has been one of the most productive farm programs ever devised.

It is my understanding the proposed reorganization of the program would require that participating farmers pay 50 percent of the cost of conservation practices. Let me reflect briefly on the accomplishments of the Soil Conservation Service.

The program was conceived at a time when the farmers of the United States could ill afford to spend money to conserve and rehabilitate America's greatest resource—the soil, which is the base of our economy. In 1936 when the conservation programs were born, much of our farmland had been both "misused and abused" through lack of funds for rehabilitating the land and also through lack of information about conservation practices. At that time duststorms, gullies, and damaging erosion were steadily and alarmingly consuming our topsoil. Millions of acres had been

rendered unfit for crop use as a result. But the advent of conservation policy in 1936 has had miraculous effects. After 30 years of technical assistance through the Soil Conservation Service nearly 3,000 soil and water districts with nearly 2 million operators operating 648 million acres of land are engaged in conservation practices. They have applied 40 million acres of contour farming, nearly 20 million acres of stripcropping, 1.2 million miles of terracing; planted 11.3 million acres of trees; and have built 1.3 million ponds. In 1964 alone the Soil Conservation Service provided direct services to 1,123,801 landowners and farmers. Between 1 and 2 million acres of cropland were converted to other uses during the year as a result of conservation plans worked out by the Soil Conservation Service.

Through the operations of the Soil Conservation Service local needs and practices are worked out locally. The farmers themselves formulate the plans for conservation practices and are able to control and manage the same. By working together on a districtwide plan, countless advances and forward strides in meeting flood control problems and other agricultural problems have been made. Improvements in living standards can form better use of the land and water resources.

It is recognized that our future prosperity will depend on the foresight we have now in planning for the future use of all our resources. Is it not preposterous then to even suggest that this program of vital importance and significance be reduced? Every American, man, woman, and child has an interest in maintaining and conserving the productivity of our soil and for that reason careful thought must be given. The cost-sharing program proposed by the Bureau of the Budget would not work. It would not do the job the present program is doing. The \$20 million which the Bureau of the Budget wants to delete from the appropriation is a mere drop in the bucket compared to the returns from the investment. Does the Bureau of the Budget actually believe that the American farmers can afford to engage in soil conservation practices to insure that the land will be productive and fertile for future generations? It really is not his job. It is the responsibility of the Government to plan far in advance for the future. I strongly oppose the revolving fund proposal and any reduction in benefits and operations of the Soil Conservation Service and the agriculture conservation program.

A STATEMENT ON THE MARCH FROM SELMA TO MONTGOMERY, ALA.

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Speaker, it is unfortunate that in recent weeks an effort has been made by some groups to discredit the march from Selma to Montgomery, Ala. Certain sensational and unfortunate charges have been made and may indeed be made again.

In order that the RECORD may be more complete on this matter—my colleague, Senator JAVITS, has previously inserted a statement on morality in the Selma crisis issued by a group of religious leaders—I ask unanimous consent to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point a sworn statement of Dr. Theodore A. Gill, president of the San Francisco Theological Seminary in San Anselmo, Calif.

As a participant in the march, Dr. Gill's full sworn statement expressing concern at any effort "to distort the central drive and character of this historic march" is worthy, I believe, of the attention of the Members.

It is regrettable that this is even necessary, because nothing should be allowed to dim the clear need for new legislation so eloquently called for by the President to assure every citizen his or her inherent right to vote now.

As a member of a bipartisan group of Members of the House who made a private visit at our own expense to Selma in February, and who met with Dr. Martin Luther King, the legal and moral imperatives of additional legislation were all too plain. The remarkable and hopeful thing was that men and women throughout the United States, as well as many in Alabama and in the rural Black Belt counties, recognized the need for action.

It is a matter of some hope for our democracy that young men and women of our generation recognized that where any American is unconstitutionally denied the right to vote, the rights of all Americans are belittled.

Along with Members on both sides of the aisle, I have introduced voting rights bills covering Federal, State and local elections and striking down unconstitutional literacy tests and State poll taxes. It is my hope that the Judiciary Committee will soon report a voting rights bill and that it will enjoy the broadest bipartisan support.

Only in this way, can we in the House keep faith with those who believe freedom now must be made a present reality, for all Americans now. This is the message of Selma, and of the march on Montgomery, and nothing must be allowed to distort the need for this legislation, or to cast doubt on the remarkable spirit that is making the American dream come true.

Mr. Speaker, Dr. Gill's statement follows:

SWORN STATEMENT OF DR. THEODORE A. GILL, PRESIDENT OF SAN FRANCISCO THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY, SAN ANSELMO, CALIF.

(Given before Harry A. Cannon, a certified shorthand reporter and notary public in and for the city and county of San Francisco, State of California, on Monday, April 26, 1965, commencing at the hour of 10:40 a.m., at the offices of Thomas Elke, Esq., attorney at law, third floor, 333 Pine Street, San Francisco, Calif.)

Dr. Theodore A. Gill, being first duly sworn by the notary public to state the truth, the

whole truth, and nothing but the truth, testified as follows:

EXAMINATION BY MR. ELKE

Question. Would you state your name, please.

Answer. Theodore A. Gill.

Question. Where do you reside?

Answer. 124 Seminary Road in San Anselmo.

Question. What is your business or profession?

Answer. I am the clergyman of the United Presbyterian Church, United States of America, president of the seminary of that church located in San Anselmo.

Question. How long have you been a minister, Dr. Gill?

Answer. I have been a minister since 1943. Twenty-two years.

Question. Did there come a time when you were in Selma, Ala., at or about the time of the march from Selma to Montgomery?

Answer. Yes. I arrived in Selma on the 19th of March.

Question. How did you arrive?

Answer. By air.

Question. Who went with you?

Answer. Rev. George Wilson from San Gabriel, Calif. He was a seat mate. Also on the plane were another eight or nine, I should think, colleagues from the seminary and from northern California, ministerial colleagues.

Question. You arrived in Montgomery and drove to Selma?

Answer. Yes.

Question. And you were in Selma from—

Answer. From Friday morning until what I call or refer to as the march to Montgomery, until that march left on Sunday noon about—

Question. Were you continuously in the March from Sunday when it left Selma until it got into Montgomery on the Thursday?

Answer. It dispersed at the capitol on the afternoon of Thursday, the 25th.

Question. Where did you spend the night, Friday?

Answer. In the home of Clementine Murphy, a lady living in what was called the compound, the Negro section of Selma.

Question. That is a brick housing project?

Answer. Brick housing project.

Question. In the area of Brown's Chapel?

Answer. That's right. Staying with me were this George Wilson from San Gabriel and Charles Smith, an alumnus of San Francisco Theological Seminary where I work.

Question. On Saturday night did you stay in the same place?

Answer. I stayed at the same place Saturday night.

Question. Were the same people with you?

Answer. The same people were with me.

Question. Sunday night where did you stay?

Answer. Somewhere in the woods, on the line of march, the first night's bivouac, wherever that was.

Question. Monday night you were in—

Answer. Still with the marchers, at the second campsite.

Question. And Tuesday night?

Answer. Still with the marchers at the third campsite.

Question. And Wednesday night?

Answer. Wednesday night the fourth campsite was at the city of St. Jude, a Roman Catholic institution on the edge of Montgomery, and I was with the marchers there.

Question. And Thursday you left Montgomery?

Answer. Thursday night we were, all people from San Anselmo, we were on the bus going back to California.

Question. All right, sir. Will you describe generally the tent arrangement that you indicated you slept at on Sunday, Monday,

Tuesday, and Wednesday afternoon and evening?

Answer. Because our own men from the seminary were involved in setting up the tents and taking them down, we were probably more aware of the tenting situation than most other participants. There were two large tents, and two smaller tents at each of the campsites. As soon as arrangements were organized the first night, Sunday night, and it took an hour or two for things to shape down that night, one of the large tents was for the men marchers and one of the other large tents for the women.

Question. Who were the two smaller tents for, do you recall?

Answer. They were intended to be for the press. One of the smaller tents was for the press and the other for the cook shack in case it rained.

Question. Will you tell us on Sunday which of the tents you slept in?

Answer. I slept in the tent intended for the men.

Question. Were there any women in that tent?

Answer. In the first few minutes of our occupancy, when there was just a general milling around—this was the first night of the march and organizational matters were just being transmitted, for the first, I should not think, not more than an hour or so, in the midst of all the milling around, everybody was everywhere but we were all together in brightly lit tents, just wondering what the procedure should be. After about an hour of this kind of confusion, the orders came that the tent I was in at the time was to be the men's tent, and all the women, whatever women were there, should go to the other tent, and from that time on segregation was careful and complete.

Question. When you say "segregation" are you talking about segregation of sex?

Answer. Sexual segregation, yes.

Question. You mentioned these tents were lighted. Could you tell us how they were lighted?

Answer. They were lighted by just bare bulbs running from the standards; also by the light of furiously burning kerosene furnaces of some kind. And on the first night by television lights of the crews who were in there at all times. Especially until we got separated, in those first minutes of confusion the television lights were everywhere and were bright. It was the most public time of all, that first hour or so, when we weren't sure where we ought to be.

Question. Could you tell us around the tent area whether there were any security arrangements made at all?

Answer. Yes. The National Guard and the Army units were protecting the whole operation through a perimeter, a circle of soldiers around the camp every night. This was a ring of small campfires with at least two soldiers at each fire. I don't know precisely how far apart they were but probably not more than 100 feet.

Question. How far from the tents were they?

Answer. They were out about a city block from the center of the tents, off in every direction. I should say that the space between the tents and the Army patrol was patrolled regularly by the security force of the march itself.

Question. Were there any instructions with respect to any of the marchers or anybody in the tents leaving the tent area to go out in any area?

Answer. Oh, yes, and it was generally understood by all of us when you march with Army protection and helicopters hovering overhead that this was not a healthy area. I think it would hardly have taken any instruction. But I heard of those who went even to the perimeter to look out of being ordered back peremptorily. I am not aware

of any attempt or any reason for any attempt to get beyond the ring.

Question. These lights—let's just take Sunday night—how long were they on? Did there come a time when they were turned off?

Answer. I don't think so. I was awake all night because confusion reigned and did every night. Many of the marchers were young people, of high school age, boys and girls, and they were greatly exhilarated by the unusual nature of the event and worried and anxious too, and this came out in kind of high spirits but for some reason or other seemed more antic at night than in the daytime, so that we were—at least I and I'm sure a great many other adults—were awake all night and, at least to my recollection, it seemed every night. So these sleeping arrangements were very public there.

Question. We have talked about the Sunday night arrangements, and in the course of that you made some general comment with respect to the sleeping arrangements on Monday, Tuesday, and Wednesday nights. Were there any differences apart from the location of the sleeping arrangements that you described on Sunday, with respect to any of the other nights?

Answer. None, except that from the second night on, the tent crew, largely made up of our own students from San Anselmo, commandeered what had been intended to be either the cook tent or the press tent—there always was debate as to which they were occupying. But anyway it was one of the smaller tents, and they used that. On the last night I think I shared that with them. That was in St. Jude, the city of St. Jude.

Question. Will you tell us very generally, what was the procedure in the morning when you would get ready to go on the march?

Answer. On the morning we struggled up out of the mud, usually—it rained a good deal on this march—and shaped up in a long line for the library paste that the oatmeal turned into in some way, and that was it, that was our whole preparation for the day, and soon after that we were organized, and the march began again. Our men, the students from San Anselmo, who were the tent crew, then struck the tents, after we had moved out, picked up as well as they could from the grounds. But you can get more precise information from them on that.

Question. I am not talking about the time of the march. I am talking of the time in each one of these camps and I will ask you whether you saw any kind of sexual behavior between men and women or even between men and men at any one of these camps that you were in, Doctor?

Answer. Absolutely not. I—well, I will just leave it flat and categorical.

Question. Was there any kind of drinking that you know about at any of those camps?

Answer. I have heard those charges, which are the most—well, I wouldn't say most ludicrous because there have been some very funny charges filed, but they are about as amazing as any could be. Not only wasn't there any drinking, we didn't hardly even have water—at least potable water. There was a creosote truck that carried tar or something before it started lugging water for the marchers, but none of us, after one taste of it, had very frequent recourse to that. It was about as dry, as parched a 4 days as most of us ever will be able to remember. We hope.

Question. Apart from the excitement that you indicated, some of the younger marchers evidenced in the tents and your difficulty of obtaining any sleep because of that, was there any kind of partying or excitement, or any kind of abhorrent behavior of any kind that you saw while you were in any of these camp areas?

Answer. Not at all. The atmosphere was more reminiscent of evangelistic campaigns than any great political event. There was

a kind of exhilaration, even exultation about it in the midst of very difficult physical circumstances. There was very generous comradery and good fellowship, as we say, but certainly nothing dramatic, out of order, about the social relationship.

Question. With respect to the march itself—and I think you indicated to me that you were on the march continuously from its beginning to its end at the State capitol in Montgomery—could you tell us, sir, whether on that march itself, as distinguished from the time you were in the camp, did you notice any kind of unusual or even the usual sexual behavior or drinking or revelry or partying of any type?

Answer. Certainly not. Again, flat and categorical. Temperamentally, if not professionally, my own antenna are attuned for that sort of thing, so I think I would be aware of it as anything. And I would say no, except—no, except—I would say no, in recalling at the same time this very pleasant and generous attitude and atmosphere of personal acceptance which marked the whole event. I speak of now of an entirely public friendship.

Question. Would you tell us of the security arrangements during the march, with particular reference to whether people were able to get in and out of the line or go off into any nonpublic area?

Answer. Oh, my, no. This was regulated by both State and Federal and local constabulary. Most of the march, the Army men, the soldiers lined the way. Every few feet there would be another soldier standing with his gun. The press sealed the front, we couldn't get past them ahead, and we were surrounded on both sides and at the end by military units, helicopters hovered overhead almost the whole length of the way observing from there. The land itself is inhospitable along most of the march. It is a raised highway with deep swamp coming right up to the edge of the highway on both sides. It is unthinkable that anyone should wander from the group or even wanted to. It is very hostile territory.

Question. I'm speaking only of the people on the march or the people who were at the campsites. Did you notice any particular amount of obscenity or swearing or what I would call bad language?

Answer. No, I cannot recall any specific words or language from my companions and colleagues on the march. I would be less realistic than I am, I think, if I thought for a moment there weren't some pretty excited language from time to time. As I say, I do not recall specific incidents. I do recall and will never forget the sustained and repetitive and unimaginative brutal obscenity of the white Alabamans who lined the route for long stretches. This was as foul as we have in the English language and it was excessive. But these were not marchers; these were people hostile to the march.

Question. All right, sir, based on your experience as a minister and the time you were on the march, would you give us your reaction to the character of the behavior of the people that were on the march or the people that were at the campsites?

Answer. Yes. I would think, not just on my experience as a minister but on my perceptions as a human being, it would be highly unlikely for a group as large as the group involved in this march, together as long as the members were together, if there were not somewhere in the picture some kind of hanky-panky. I did not see any. I have not talked to anybody who did see any. And I have made some effort to discover whether anybody I was with was aware of what we call "carrying on." But just in general, I must say I would be very surprised if there wasn't somewhere, somehow, although the ingenuity and the athleticism that would have been involved in this defy my imagination. But this is an entirely general observation. It would be very surprising if

somehow or other in a group of this many college and high school kids some of that particular exercise were not at least attempted. My further generalization would be, though, that if so, this would be in far smaller percentage than is going on now by my observation of most college or university campuses of the country in much more normal situations.

But in all these last remarks I have been addressing myself to a hypothetical possibility which I find it reasonable to entertain but of which I had no evidence.

Question. Based on your observation, sir, would you care to generally characterize the general behavior of the people on the march or the people who were setting up the tents with respect to their general approach to what they were doing and the general reaction you felt there of the people involved in this endeavor?

Answer. Yes. The atmosphere was mingled hilarity and gravity. Everybody involved was fully aware of the international attention being given this event, very hopeful of the cultural consequences of this event, but we were all also full of the novelty of the occasion and enjoying each other's presence so that the atmosphere was, as I said a moment ago, mingled pleasure and deep purpose. I think I have already observed that there were at least religious overtones to the whole project and this was evidenced in the atmosphere and in the attitude of the people involved.

As a participant, I resent deeply any effort to pick up isolated incidents, however they may be documented, and suggest that they represent in any way what the point of this event was or what the prevailing mood of it was, or what the large generality of its action was, and I would assume that the intelligent and sophisticated Congressmen would resent, as much as those of us on the march, any effort to be treated as innocent or ignorant people who cannot distinguish between the accidents of the event and the large central purpose and action of the event.

Question. Could you tell us quite generally what you did in Selma before the march started?

Answer. Well, there was a good deal of milling around for the 2 days before the march was organized. We went to meetings, we attended rallies, we listened to preaching, we did a good deal of singing. There was very little sleeping on anybody's part, formal or informal. The place was charged. For most of us it was the first experience of being contained within a military shield. Everything was very close, very compressed, and everybody was under everybody else's observation. This was an extremely public event.

Question. Did you notice anything untoward there with respect to sexual behavior or drinking or partying or anything of that sort?

Answer. Absolutely not. From the point of view of diet, it was the soberest event on record, I am sure. From the point of view of personal spirits, maybe one of the most excited.

Question. Apart from what you told us, is there any particular thing that stands out in your mind, of any kind or character, that you feel you would like to get on the record?

Answer. No, except what I have already suggested in some of the other answers, a kind of angry bewilderment at any effort to distort by seizing at peripheral evidences, whatever they may be, to distort the central drive and character of this historic march. I can only suppose—because I would like to put a good light on this whole latest development—I can only suppose such effort to distort represents the action of men who know that they have been beaten on the main argument, that they cannot win on points and so now they must destroy the challenger.

Question. Dr. Gill, it is obvious that you just didn't show up here. Could you give us a little bit of the background as to the circumstances of why you are here and why I am taking these statements and why we are taking the statements of the remainder of the people.

Answer. Word came to us in San Anselmo from churchmen in Washington, speaking through the person of Rodney Shaw.

Question. Who is Rodney Shaw?

Answer. A Methodist liaison man to the operation of the American Government, and assigned liaison man for the Methodist Church; that charges would be made on the floor of the House of Representatives on Tuesday of this week, April 27. The nature of these charges has been well advertised by Congressman DICKINSON; and people who had been on or near the march and in accord with its aim have been very disturbed at the thought of the possibility of its character being so distorted at this late date and so Mr. Shaw called me up on Sunday, April 25, and asked me, as one who had made the whole march and also as the president of the seminary from which so many members of the tent and cleanup crew had come, whether we had any evidence one way or the other. This is no effort to obscure evidence. We are concerned about the truth. And Mr. Shaw wondered what we had seen. So among us we decided to make this as legal and binding, since the whole crew of us cannot go to Washington, as we wish, and that is where this interrogation comes in. We would like to get it on the record, our observation, in the hopes that a moralistic hearing will not drag the whole country's attention from the tremendous moral purpose of the whole operation.

Mr. ELKE. Thank you.

THEODORE A. GILL.

CERTIFICATION

State of California, city and county of San Francisco

I hereby certify that Dr. Theodore A. Gill was by me duly sworn to testify the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth; that said statement was reported at the time and place therein stated; that the testimony of said Dr. Theodore A. Gill was reported by me, Harry A. Cannon, a certified shorthand reporter and a disinterested party, and was thereafter transcribed into typewriting. I further certify that I am not of counsel or attorney for either or any of the parties to said statement.

In witness whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and affixed my seal of office this 26th day of April, 1965.

HARRY A. CANNON,

Notary Public in and for the City and County of San Francisco, State of California.

STATE OF INDIANA PROUD OF MAJ. VIRGIL I. "GUS" GRISSOM

Mr. ROUDEBUSH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

THE SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROUDEBUSH. Mr. Speaker, quite naturally, the State of Indiana is proud of Maj. Virgil I. "Gus" Grissom.

We Hoosiers would like to think that Major Grissom is a typical Indiana product, but, of course, his space feats as a member of our astronaut team place him in the most select group of Americans.

Major Grissom and his family will honor all Hoosiers on May 31 by attending the world-famous speed classic—the Indianapolis 500-mile race.

There is no other person in the United States whom Hoosiers would prefer to have as their honored guest on this occasion, and the entire State of Indiana is looking forward to Major Grissom coming back home for the big race.

A recent editorial presented by Indianapolis television station WISH-TV, and an article in the Washington, D.C., Star by Mr. William Hines, state very clearly why Indiana thinks so much of Virgil Grissom.

Mr. Speaker, these two statements merit the consideration of this entire body, and I request and am privileged to include them in the RECORD, as follows:

INDIANA'S FRONTIERSMAN IN SPACE

(Editorial by WISH-TV 8, Mar. 22, 1965)

It would be quite an understatement to say that Indiana has just a special interest in the launching of this Nation's first two-man space vehicle. For no other State can really claim a greater personal share in the Gemini launch than can Indiana.

Virgil "Gus" Grissom, the command pilot of the Gemini spacecraft, is every inch a Hoosier. Born and raised in the southern Indiana town of Mitchell, he's the very personification of the hometown boy who made good.

The Hoosier heritage of Gus Grissom runs deep. His parents—the Dennis Grissoms, of Mitchell—still live in the same house that they moved into when Gus was only a year old. Gus grew up as might any other youngster in a small Indiana town, delivering newspapers and working summers in a grocery store and meat market.

He completed his early schooling in Mitchell, where he met and married his wife, the former Betty Moore. And like many other young marrieds, the Grissoms worked together to earn Gus a degree in engineering from Purdue University.

Now after a 1961 flight into space in the Mercury program, Gus Grissom is on the verge of making further history with the Gemini launch. And we don't think we really need to say that his family and friends in Mitchell are being joined in their feelings of pride by Hoosiers all over the State.

People like Gus Grissom are rare individuals in a society where "just getting by" seems to be a current philosophy. But it has been the pioneering Gus Grissoms of this Nation who have made America the country that it is, through courage, dedication, and personal sacrifice.

Gus Grissom is as much the frontiersman of the space age, as were those people who braved oceans and crossed mountains to extend the boundaries of the United States in its earliest days. And our descendants will be just as much in his debt.

[From the Washington Star]

GUS GRISSOM HAS SPUNK AND SENSE OF HUMOR

(By William Hines)

Basically, Gus Grissom is my kind of hero. He's a homely little guy who dislikes newsmen—an attitude that is extremely easy to understand. Reporters have been putting him down ever since he lost *Liberty Bell-7* almost 4 years ago.

The *Liberty Bell* incident is the story of Gus' life. He's the type for whom everything goes perfectly (up to a point), and that's the story of my life, too. He is a man that a typical Walter Mitty can relate to without straining.

Gus is John Glenn reduced to life size and stripped of his merit badges. He'll never be anyone's "most unforgettable character," but he was the only comic relief the space program had after Shorty Powers left to sell cars, until John Young came along. And John, of course, is intentionally funny.

Everyone in the space effort takes his job very seriously, which is exactly as it should be, but everyone also takes himself very seriously—which is not so good.

Everyone except Gus. You don't catch him making inspirational little talks or running for the Senate or doing "Smokey-the-Bear" type commercials. He keeps his eyes open and his mouth shut (most of the time), plays it straight, and if things don't go just exactly right, brushes himself off, puts on a fresh bandaid, and is at it again.

Things have a way of not going just exactly right for the ride of the Mitchell boy. *Liberty Bell-7* was only one example.

Gus is not much of a talker, but sometimes he manages to squeeze a size eight shoe into a size two mouth to the consternation of his bosses and eventually of himself. Like his visit to the Titan plant outside Baltimore, when he commented to the effect that the rocket wasn't likely to get off the ground.

Gus ate his crow some time later, when the Space Agency stood him up and made him say publicly:

"I am here today to tell you Titan is 'Go.'"

People are always standing Gus up and telling him to talk. One time when he was on a television interview, he remarked that he wouldn't be there if he hadn't been ordered to.

In fact, Gus and his traveling companion, John Young, together said considerably less than Glenn said alone. Before the Gemini-Titan-3 mission there were no long delays like those before Glenn's flight, so Gus was not called on to say things like Glenn's famous, "The delay will only serve to hone the edge more sharply."

Gus is no more reticent than any of the other astronauts when the loot is being passed out. He is not interested in limelight; he follows Omar's advice: "Ah, take the cash and let the credit go, nor heed the rumble of a distant drum."

Gus is a grouchy, taciturn, introverted and not-very-lovable character who sometimes seems out of place in a lineup of all-American boys. There are those who would not give you 27 cents a pound for him, dressed and drawn, but one thing you've got to concede Grissom—he's got spunk and a sense of humor.

As I said, Gus Grissom is my kind of hero.

UNNECESSARY COST, WASTE, AND INEFFICIENCY IN PROGRAMS UNDER JURISDICTION OF AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT

Mr. ERLBORN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. ERLBORN. Mr. Speaker, on two previous occasions I have discussed unnecessary costs, wastes and inefficiencies found in the administration of programs under the jurisdiction of the Agency for International Development.

Each example of improper or inadequate administration by AID has been contained in reports to the Congress

from the Office of the Comptroller General.

Today I wish to call your attention to still another example of inept administration found in a report issued on April 15, 1965, by GAO entitled "Failure To Effectively Utilize Excess U.S.-Owned Foreign Currencies To Pay International Air Travel Ticket Costs Being Paid in U.S. Dollars."

In this study the Comptroller General advises Congress of an annual loss, estimated at \$2.3 million, when U.S. moneys are used, to buy airline tickets for official travel to and from eight countries instead of using U.S.-owned foreign currencies.

The eight countries involved in the report are: Burma, India, Israel, Pakistan, Poland, United Arab Republic, Yugoslavia, and Indonesia.

The reported \$2.3 million annual estimated loss concerning these countries is divided between two categories:

The first involves an estimated unnecessary expenditure of \$1.2 million because U.S. agencies have failed to develop, or have not adhered to, administrative regulations requiring maximum use of foreign currency.

The second involves an estimated \$1.1 million annual expenditure of U.S. dollars because the State Department failed to obtain an agreement with Indonesia to allow the tickets to be paid for with excess United States-owned Indonesian rupiahs.

The unnecessary expenditures were not totally made by the Agency for International Development. The Department of State, the Department of Defense, and the U.S. Information Agency, too, failed to utilize excess U.S.-owned foreign currencies.

The Comptroller General notes that overall 31 percent of international air travel tickets eligible for payment in U.S.-owned foreign currencies were paid for in dollars instead of available foreign currencies.

The report states 42 percent of AID travel tickets eligible for payment in foreign currency were paid for with U.S. dollars.

I mention this report because once again it demonstrates the apparent disregard agencies of the United States seem to have for the rules and regulations under which they should operate.

The Comptroller General's report states:

This report is being issued to the Congress because it demonstrates a laxity on the part of agency officials in making effective use of the substantial amounts of excess foreign currencies owned by the U.S. Government, despite congressional and executive branch interest in using these currencies to substitute dollar expenditures and to alleviate continuing U.S. balance-of-payment deficits.

I would be remiss if I did not add the Comptroller General was most hopeful his recommendations would be adhered to by the involved agencies in the future. GAO reports the agencies did recognize their carelessness in not utilizing excess U.S.-owned foreign currencies in this instance.

I wish to mention one other report from GAO today.

On March 19 of this year the Comptroller General's Office issued a report entitled "Unnecessary Costs Resulting From an Inflexible Policy of Donating Flour Instead of Wheat to Voluntary Relief Agencies for Distribution Abroad."

While the report's title may be long, the study itself is comparatively short. It deals with unnecessary costs amounting to about \$3.7 million incurred by the U.S. Government in the surplus flour program to voluntary relief agencies for distribution to the needy people in the Republic of China.

The \$3.7 million waste took place under the administration of the Agency for International Development and policies set by the Department of Agriculture.

Like other reports by the GAO concerning AID this one has worldwide application. While the specific example under study involves the Republic of China, the problem involves many other AID programs in many other nations.

The Comptroller General's Office advises Congress they "believe several million dollars could be saved each year on a worldwide basis if the Department of Agriculture revised its policy to permit the delivery of wheat, instead of flour, to those countries which have the milling capacity and the capability for processing and distributing wheat products."

The impact of a change in policy can be assessed when it is noted that the Department of Agriculture reports that in fiscal 1964 some 14 voluntary agencies distributed over 1 billion pounds of flour in 72 countries.

At present, the Department of Agriculture through AID could donate processed commodities, but the language of the act needs clarification.

The Comptroller General's office reports, that in this case, AID officials seem most willing to cooperate to enact any savings.

GAO advises that the Congress may wish "to enact legislation which would amend section 416 of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, to permit the donation of processed commodities, such as flour, instead of whole grains, to voluntary agencies for distribution abroad only after the Secretary of Agriculture has determined on a case-by-case basis that it would not significantly increase costs to the United States to do so."

The Comptroller General further states his office would "be pleased to assist in drafting such proposed legislation."

I have mentioned this GAO report because it does involve AID.

It is apparent to me that, while AID, in the case of donations of flour to voluntary agencies in the Republic of China, seemed willing to enact economies, AID generally has not been economy minded or efficient in its operations.

Furthermore, the combined impact of the Comptroller General's reports involving AID indicates the Agency for International Development is not—

Operating in a most efficient and economical manner;

Following public law in all cases; Adhering to the policies approved by the Congress;

Of its own accord seeking out inefficiencies and waste.

I urge the Congress to initiate a study of the multiplicity of activities of the Agency for International Development.

WATER POLLUTION

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Speaker, at the present time, all America is acutely aware of its water problems. Yesterday, the House passed a bill to attack the problem of water pollution. All communications media resound with news of flood devastation throughout the Mississippi River Valley.

It has been proposed, in a suggestion we can only hope will receive serious reconsideration, that a substantial reduction be made in appropriations for the soil conservation service.

Mr. Speaker, when the floodwaters roll over the business districts of Hannibal, Mo., and other cities along the Mississippi, and when hundreds of thousands of acres of farmlands stand desolated by destructive torrents from our rivers, it is somewhat late to seek to control these waters. I submit a far more effective and useful job can be done through the support and, indeed, the expansion of our soil conservation service program, so that our natural water resources may be employed to improve rather than to inundate the American family farm.

I would call to the attention an acute analysis of this problem presented by Don Sosey, mayor of Palmyra, Mo., and editor of the Palmyra Spectator, as follows:

MAY NOT BE A WISE DECISION

We have been a firm believer in economy in government for many years and have frequently written articles about it, but occasionally the cut may come in the wrong place. It is being proposed to make a considerable reduction in the appropriation for the Soil Conservation Service, which would curtail much of the technical assistance given in setting up plans for the management and preservation of farmlands throughout the Nation. The idea is to have the landowner pay approximately 50 percent of the cost.

This might be all right if the farmer could be induced to do so, but a large majority of them feel that the land will last throughout their lifetime and they will not have to make this extra expenditure. While land is owned by individuals it is also the heritage of our country and one which is important to every citizen today and also to future generations. To allow it to become marginal and then non-productive would be inviting famine at some future date. The wornout and eroded soil of many countries has caused food to be scarce in them and hunger and malnutrition to be high.

Even with the technical aid the Soil Conservation Service has been giving, it is difficult to obtain the cooperation of all land owners. Without this aid soil districts would probably lose much of their usefulness. We believe there are many other departments of Government, which could stand a reduction far better than the Conservation Service.

For a number of years we have believed that the most useful money expended by the Federal Government in water control is at its source. If through the construction of terraces, structures, ponds, timber and grass strips on the lands where the water originates its flow can be slowed, giving it a chance to seep into the ground, then the erosion will be checked and the heavy silting of our main streams will decrease. Such a plan can also raise the level of our water table and lessen the danger of water shortage.

Dams and levees have been constructed to control floods, but slowing the runoff at the source would be much more effective in the long run. The Soil Conservation Service provides the most important aid, which can be given by the Government to the landowner, and it should not be curtailed when so much remains to be done and there is such unnecessary waste in other departments of Government.

IMMIGRATION HEARINGS

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity to announce that hearings on pending immigration legislation by the Subcommittee on Immigration and Nationality have been delayed necessarily because of consideration of the voting rights bill by the full Judiciary Committee.

Our hearings opened on March 3, 1965, at which time Attorney General Nicholas Katzenbach appeared before the subcommittee. Secretary of State Dean Rusk, Secretary of Labor Willard Wirtz, and representatives of the U.S. Public Health Service appeared at subsequent hearings. We have taken testimony from interested Members of Congress and the record of hearings is still open for inclusion of statements from other interested Members.

It has been necessary to cancel scheduled hearings on three occasions since completing testimony from the Public Health Service on March 31, 1965.

I wish to assure representatives of nongovernmental organizations and the interested public who have made written requests to appear, that we expect to take up this phase of our hearings during the week beginning May 10. Full Judiciary Committee meetings preclude setting an earlier date. Notice will be provided witnesses of the day and time set for their appearance.

REPORT ON REFUGEE ADMISSIONS

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my re-

marks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio? There was no objection.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to the provisions of the act of July 14, 1960—Public Law 86-648—the so-called fair share law, enabling the United States to participate in the resettlement of certain refugees, the Attorney General is directed to forward to the Congress every 6 months a report on administrative operations authorized under that law.

In view of the continuing interest of my colleagues in the House and for their information, I wish to include in the RECORD at this point the ninth semi-annual report of the Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization covering the operations from July 1 to December 31, 1964, together with a summary covering the preceding eight semiannual periods.

Detailed case reports on each person paroled into the United States are in the custody of the Committee on the Judiciary and are available for inspection by any Member of the House at the office of subcommittee No. 1 at 2139-A Rayburn House Office Building.

The report which is addressed to the Speaker of the House of Representatives is as follows:

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE, IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION SERVICE,

Washington, D.C., February 4, 1965.

HON. JOHN W. MCCORMACK,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Refugee operations under the act of July 14, 1960, as amended by the act of June 28, 1962, were continued during the 6-month period ending December 31, 1964. This was the ninth 6-month period of operations under the act. During the preceding 6-month period, according to advisory report furnished by the Secretary of State, 17,651 refugee-escapees, as specified in section 1 of the act, availed themselves of resettlement opportunities offered by nations other than the United States. Accordingly, the number authorized by statutory "fair share" during the period covered by this report was 4,413. During the period, 1,994 registrations were received from refugees in the seven countries in which refugee operations were carried out under the act.

In addition to the 1,994 refugees who registered under the act during the 6-month period, there were 366 registrations pending at the beginning of the period, making a total of 2,360 refugee applicants available for consideration. Of these, 1,485 were found qualified for parole and 348 were rejected or otherwise closed, leaving 527 registrations pending at the end of the period.

The following reflects the activity in each of the countries in which the refugee operations were conducted during the period:

| Country | Registrations pending June 30, 1964 | Registrations received during period | Total | Found qualified for parole | Rejected or otherwise closed | Pending Dec. 31, 1964 |
|--------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|-------|----------------------------|------------------------------|-----------------------|
| Germany..... | 13 | 130 | 143 | 49 | 51 | 43 |
| France..... | 50 | 349 | 399 | 261 | 78 | 60 |
| Austria..... | 31 | 152 | 183 | 99 | 25 | 59 |
| Belgium..... | 11 | 24 | 35 | 7 | 22 | 5 |
| Italy..... | 230 | 965 | 1,195 | 772 | 89 | 334 |
| Greece..... | 16 | 59 | 75 | 37 | 19 | 19 |
| Lebanon..... | 15 | 315 | 330 | 260 | 63 | 7 |
| Total..... | 366 | 1,994 | 2,360 | 1,485 | 348 | 527 |

Established screening procedures resulted in the rejection of 122 applicants during the period, on the following grounds:

| | |
|---|-----|
| Ineligible..... | 19 |
| Security grounds..... | 18 |
| Criminal grounds..... | 3 |
| Medical grounds..... | 4 |
| Immorality..... | 0 |
| Undesirability..... | 7 |
| Firmly settled..... | 26 |
| Split families (spouses and children left behind in country of origin)..... | 11 |
| Spouses and children of above principals..... | 34 |
| Total..... | 122 |

As of December 31, 1964, the total number of refugee-escapees authorized by statutory "fair share" since the effective date of the act totaled 31,467 and a total of 29,714 refugees had registered since the beginning of the program. Statistics for the program are tabulated below:

| | 1st through 8th periods | 9th period | Total |
|---|-------------------------|------------|--------|
| Authorized by statutory fair share..... | 27,054 | 4,413 | 31,467 |
| Pending beginning of period..... | | 366 | |
| Registered during period..... | 27,720 | 1,994 | 29,714 |
| Total registered (pending plus received)..... | 27,720 | 2,360 | |
| Found qualified for parole..... | 17,408 | 1,485 | 18,893 |
| Rejected or otherwise closed..... | 9,946 | 348 | 10,294 |
| Pending end of period..... | 366 | 527 | |

Of the refugees approved for parole to date, 365 have been approved under section 2(b) of the act, which provides for a numerical limitation of 500 "difficult to resettle" cases.

A total of 18,022 refugees, in whose cases assurances of housing and employment have been received, have been referred to the Intergovernmental Committee for European Migration for transportation to the United States. Of these, 16,322 had arrived in the United States as of December 31, 1964, as follows:

| Country of flight | During 1st 8 periods | During 9th period | Total |
|-----------------------------------|----------------------|-------------------|--------|
| Albania..... | 432 | 18 | 450 |
| Bulgaria..... | 257 | 67 | 324 |
| Czechoslovakia..... | 15 | 9 | 24 |
| East Germany..... | 5 | 0 | 5 |
| Estonia..... | 14 | 0 | 14 |
| Hungary..... | 1,426 | 112 | 1,538 |
| Iraq..... | 26 | 0 | 26 |
| Jordan..... | 2 | 0 | 2 |
| Latvia..... | 70 | 0 | 70 |
| Libya..... | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| Lithuania..... | 39 | 0 | 39 |
| Poland..... | 929 | 41 | 970 |
| Rumania..... | 2,988 | 785 | 3,773 |
| Syrian Arab Republic..... | 46 | 6 | 52 |
| Turkey..... | 15 | 0 | 15 |
| United Arab Republic (Egypt)..... | 2,861 | 181 | 3,042 |
| U.S.S.R..... | 93 | 5 | 98 |
| Yugoslavia..... | 5,357 | 522 | 5,879 |
| Total..... | 14,576 | 1,746 | 16,322 |

Registrations of applicants in the various countries, since the beginning of the program, have been as follows:

| Country | In camp | Out of camp | Total |
|--------------|---------|-------------|--------|
| Austria..... | 996 | 2,435 | 3,431 |
| Belgium..... | | 1,602 | 1,602 |
| France..... | | 8,759 | 8,759 |
| Germany..... | 630 | 3,382 | 4,012 |
| Greece..... | 986 | 290 | 1,276 |
| Italy..... | 4,467 | 2,603 | 7,070 |
| Lebanon..... | | 3,564 | 3,564 |
| Total..... | 7,079 | 22,635 | 29,714 |

Of the refugees who registered during the ninth period, 397 were camp residents and 1,597 were out-of-camp residents.

As of December 31, 1964, a total of 8,600 aliens, who have been in the United States for at least 2 years after their parole as refugee-escapees had been inspected and examined for admission, and accorded the status of permanent residents under section 4 of the act.

During the ninth period, the Congress approved private laws for four aliens in the United States, providing that these aliens shall be held and considered to have been paroled into the United States as provided for in the act of July 14, 1960.

In compliance with the provisions of section 2(a) of the act, detailed reports on individuals paroled into the United States are attached.

Sincerely,

RAYMOND F. FARRELL,
Commissioner.

THE DOMINICAN CRISIS

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, President Johnson is to be highly commended for his prompt action in sending in U.S. marines to the Dominican Republic to protect U.S. citizens in the country.

I sincerely hope the Marines may also serve as an indication of U.S. assistance to protect the freedom and stability of the government in that area of the world.

Although the activities of the original revolutionary forces in the country were apparently led by freedom-loving people, as far as the leadership was concerned, it seems clear to me now that the present leadership of the revolution is in the hands of Castro-Cuban-trained Communist agents.

Under these circumstances it is necessary, I believe, for the Organization of American States, or the United States acting independently, to bolster the stable and free government in the country to prevent another Cuba.

Today I have reintroduced a resolution, first introduced in 1961 by me, that asserts the sense of Congress to be that in emergency situations such as the one we have today that the United States and other free countries in this hemisphere do not have to wait on the action of the Organization of American States to deal with emergencies of this type.

The resolution follows:

Whereas the intervention of international communism directly or indirectly in an American republic would constitute a fact or situation threatening the sovereignty and political independence of the states of the entire New World; and

Whereas the American continents, by the free and independent position which they have assumed and maintained, have long since ceased to be considered as subjects for future colonization by any European power or powers; and

Whereas the intervention of international communism, directly or indirectly, or however disguised, in any American state, would be in effect such a colonization by a non-American power or powers, and would violate

the sovereignty and political independence of an American state; and

Whereas such a fact or situation extended to any portions of this hemisphere would be dangerous to the peace and safety of the United States and the American continents; and

Whereas the American Republics have condemned intervention or the threat of intervention, even when conditional, from any extrahemispheric power and have rejected the attempt of the Sino-Soviet conspiracy in its attempt to destroy hemispheric unity and security; and

Whereas in the rapidly developing contingencies of the atomic age there might not be time to assemble a meeting of the Inter-American Organ of Consultation to provide for joint action to repel the danger: Therefore be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That if such a fact or situation should present a sudden emergency, then any one or more of the high contracting parties to the Inter-American Treaty of Reciprocal Assistance would be justified, in the exercise of individual or collective self-defense under article 51 of the Charter of the United Nations, in taking steps to forestall intervention, domination, control, and colonization by international communism in the New World.

In case of such defensive measures having been taken by the defending state or states, it or they should report to the Inter-American Organ of Consultation, to the end that an emergency committee, after the manner provided by the Convention of Havana of 1940, be set up for the provisional administration of the state thus defended, pending its restoration to a government of the people, by the people, and for the people.

WARSAW GHETTO UPRISING

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, spring is a time of year when all nature seems to come back to life. It is a joyous time; a time of renewal; a time of regeneration.

But, over two decades ago spring was not such a time for the Jewish inhabitants of the Warsaw ghetto; for theirs was a spring of sorrow, a spring of tragedy, a spring of death.

To speak of the Warsaw ghetto is to speak again of man's inhumanity to man.

Before Poland was overrun by the German and Soviet military forces in September 1939, the Jewish population of Poland was estimated at 3 million. On the eve of the invasion the population of the Warsaw ghetto was placed at approximately 300,000. After the Nazi and Soviet conquest of Poland, Jews from other areas throughout Poland were brought into the ghetto. The ill-fated inhabitants of the ghetto now numbered an estimated 450,000.

This is a formidable number of people, a number almost equivalent to the population of the city of Buffalo, N.Y.

These people, these unfortunate souls, imprisoned in their ghetto, were destined by fate and by the will of their Nazi overlords for total extermination; they were destined to be destroyed in the Nazi crematoriums.

In November 1940 the Nazi rulers of Warsaw began to take measures that would eventually lead to the so-called "final solution" of Poland's Jews. At that time the Warsaw ghetto was sealed off, and the prisoners, subjected to starvation, disease, and cruel and inhuman treatment by their Nazi captors, awaited the tolling of their death knell.

The destruction of the Warsaw ghetto and its inhabitants was carried out in an orderly and systematic manner, a manner that fits very well the image and reality of Nazi precision and thoroughness.

The "final solution" got underway in the summer of 1942.

On July 22, 1942, the Nazi forces began a systematic reduction of the Warsaw ghetto. On that day, they transported 6,289 persons to Treblinka where they perished.

On the following day, July 23, another 7,815 were transported; on July 24, another 7,444.

During the period from July 2 to July 23, 66,701 were taken from the ghetto.

In August, another 142,353 were removed.

In September, the number was 56,730.

It has been said that after this forced evacuation during the summer of 1942 only an estimated 40,000 to 50,000 Jews remained in the Warsaw ghetto. Reduced in numbers but not in their determination these human remnants of the Warsaw ghetto began in January 1943 to stage an open resistance to the Nazi campaign of extermination.

Let me say at this point that the details I am about to relate are taken from an account written in May 1943 by eyewitnesses.

According to this account, in early December 1942 a new wave of massacres and deportations began. Rumors circulated in Warsaw that January was the deadline. On January 18, the Germans began a campaign of total destruction that led to the obliteration of the Warsaw ghetto.

Early in the morning on January 18, strong detachments of the Nazi SS and their henchmen entered the ghetto. But, to their surprise some of the imprisoned Jews, in a final act of desperation, barricaded themselves in blocks of houses and mounted a bitter and heroic last-ditch fight.

In the first few days of the attack the Germans lost a score of dead and a few score wounded. The battle raged on until January 23, whereupon German tanks drove into the ghetto. Houses were burned down, and their dispossessed inhabitants were captured and killed. Over a thousand Jews perished.

However, the majority in the ghetto were forced to submit to the Nazi terror. Large transports departed each day for Treblinka; and after a few days this initial resistance to their Nazi oppressors ceased. The fate of the tragic remnants in the ghetto was still undecided.

A new crest of terror and violence was reached in April 1943. By this time many older men, women, and children, who had survived the deportations during the summer and fall, had been taken from the ghetto. But most of the

younger men and women resisted offers of removal because they knew that every step from the ghetto would bring them closer to death. These young heroic Jews, these Davids of the beleaguered Warsaw ghetto, vowed to resist to the end from their imprisoned citadel.

Recognizing the danger of keeping tens of thousands of resolute young people in this concentrated area, the Germans decided to move in and liquidate the ghetto by force.

On the eve of the Passover in April 1943, the Nazi overlords made their decision. Many in the ghetto were slowly starving to death. Others were dying of disease. Living conditions, such as they were, were intolerably miserable. Their numbers dwindling, these heroic defenders had little hope for survival as the Nazis attacked en masse on April 19, 1943, in their last effort to destroy the imprisoned Jews and level the ghetto to the ground.

The "final solution" began suddenly at dawn on the 19th. The formal reason for the sudden strike was the failure of the Jews to answer a call for workers to be sent to Trawniki. Only 200 had responded and this did not meet the Nazi quota. Forthwith the ghetto was surrounded by SS men, German police, and their henchmen. Units of Germans, heavily armed with machineguns, grenades, and armored trucks, entered through the Zamenhof Street gate to the ghetto.

Though expecting some resistance, the Germans must have been surprised at the fury of the initial engagement in which they suffered serious losses. Within a few hours the first German attack was repulsed; the Germans retreated to the borders of the ghetto and called for reinforcements of tanks and artillery. Striking again with unrestrained fury, the Germans broke through the first line of defense. In the face of heavy artillery fire, the defenders fought back with machinegun fire, causing still further serious German losses. In this engagement the Nazi losses included two tanks.

Now the Germans were forced to use more powerful means, namely, to direct artillery fire from airplane observation and set fire to all houses. Changing their tactics, the Nazis refrained from attacking in the daytime using this time for observation. But during the night they launched a merciless barrage and burned block after block of houses in the outer streets of the ghetto. What the Nazi planned to do was to reduce the area of the struggle gradually and starve out the beleaguered fighters.

During the nights of April 23-25, the Germans mounted a heavy barrage of artillery fire.

On the last day of the attack, the resistance weakened; the defense was now sporadic; and the ghetto was terrorized by enormous fires that consumed the rubble with its tragic human litter. Eventually the ghetto was split by the attacking Germans, forcing the defenders to retreat to the northern part of the city. Those who had not participated in the uprising were seized by the Nazis and transported to prison camps.

The thoroughness of the Nazi drive to destroy the ghetto was appallingly precise. Success on the night of April 23 was so considerable that now they decided to employ only long-range artillery. In addition to this they confined themselves to setting street after street to the torch and making escape impossible from this flaming inferno.

German guards shot every person within range whom they had seen in the ghetto.

They destroyed the openings of sewers on Plac Krasinski, Leszno, and Bonifraterska Street through which attempts to escape were made.

Germans patrolled neighboring streets in order to catch those escaping. Those who were captured were shot on the spot. It was estimated that during the period from April 19 to May 5, about 3,000 Jews were killed in this manner.

Then the Germans published large placards declaring that the ghetto was being liquidated and that those Poles who were sheltering Jews would be severely treated by the occupation authorities. An announcement from the German commander called on the population to turn over any Jews who were in hiding.

In the early days of May the struggle in the ghetto stopped suddenly; resistance to the German oppressors was broken. There was no hope of survival against the heavy fires that swept over the ghetto. Hundreds of houses were destroyed, numerous streets were pulverized, and those houses remaining were destroyed by dynamite. The material loss from this calculated, diabolical campaign was greater than that which had occurred in the bombing of 1939. Fires raged on for 15 days. The great synagogue on Tlomackie Street situated a short distance outside the ghetto was destroyed by German demolition crews.

In what was called the small ghetto, the Germans used other tactics than those applied in the large ghetto. They did not come with tanks and artillery. Jews were ruthlessly seized from their workshops, deported, or killed. Through the early part of May the Germans had succeeded in killing and deporting 12,000 Jews. The liquidation of the small ghetto occurred, without a struggle, on May 15-18, 1943. All remaining Jews were deported or killed while their houses were leveled to the ground.

Thus, Gen. Jurgen Stoop, the Nazi commander of the attacking forces, could triumphantly announce: "There was a Jewish section in Warsaw, but it no longer exists."

These remarks, as I said before, are based upon eyewitness accounts written in May 1943. Let me quote from the last two paragraphs of this account:

Today [that is, May 1943], the Warsaw ghetto consists only of the remains of hundreds of burned and ruined houses. The number of Jewish victims has not been counted and will probably never be counted, because the bodies of fighters were burned along with the houses. Hundreds of suffocated and burned bodies are to be found in the cellars of these houses. It is estimated that 5,000 Jews died within the iron ring of fire and shell. The rest were left to the Germans, and were tortured to death in execution camps. Only those who escaped from

the ghetto and hid in the Aryan part of Warsaw are left in the city.

A Jewish fighting organization led the defense in the ghetto. Their forces were small, they did not have much ammunition. Nevertheless they fought for 4 weeks to better effect than the Germans in this tragic struggle.

Mr. Speaker, 22 years ago courage and heroism abounded in the confines of the Warsaw ghetto. There can be no doubt of that. The few thousand Jews who had arms with which to fight fought as soldiers of freedom. They fought in the spirit and with the fury of the ancient Hebrews who sought so desperately to turn back the onslaught of their enemies. The odds against them were enormous, and yet their heroism shone through their miserable condition like a glowing light when in a last spasm of courage they struck at the enemy and were consumed by artillery and flames.

This tragic struggle must stand as another one of the many monuments of Nazi inhumanity toward mankind. Such inhumanity casts doubt upon man's capacity to progress into a new era of enlightenment. Yet we must not allow the tragedies of history to overwhelm our judgment of man's capacity for good.

We must never lose faith in mankind. Let us, therefore, find some solace in this tribute to the misery of a great and tragic people. This poem, called "A Child in the Warsaw Ghetto," is taken from the Warsaw ghetto paper, *Gazeta Zydowska*:

From tomorrow on, I shall be sad
From tomorrow on!
Today I shall be gay
What is the use of sadness—tell me that?
Because these evil winds begin to blow?

Why should I grieve for tomorrow—today?
Tomorrow may be so good, so sunny,
Tomorrow the sun may shine for us again
We will no longer need to be sad.

From tomorrow on, I shall be sad
From tomorrow on!
Not today; no! today I will be glad
And every day, no matter how bitter it be,
I shall say:
From tomorrow on, I shall be sad,
Not today!

A POINT OF PERSONAL PRIVILEGE

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD on a point of personal privilege.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise to inform the Members here of a grave breach of privilege which may threaten the integrity of the House.

At present I am being subjected to a criminal prosecution in a case which is not criminal in nature. Article I, section 6, of the U.S. Constitution states that Senators and Representatives "shall in all cases, except treason, felony, and breach of the peace, be privileged from arrest during the attendance at the sessions of their respective Houses, and going to and returning from the same."

This has been interpreted to mean that each Representative shall have im-

munity from criminal arrest except in a criminal case. It follows that immunity from arrest renders a Representative immune from criminal prosecution. The privileges of the Members of this House are threatened by the present proceedings in New York by masking a civil case as a criminal case, thus subverting the clear intention of the Constitution.

In House Resolution 279, the Sergeant at Arms is authorized to supply certified copies of "such documents and papers in possession or control of said Sergeant at Arms as the court found to be material and relevant." I request the House to make an investigation into this matter since it is clear that it did not get sufficient information before it authorized the resolution. First of all, the affidavit used to induce the Supreme Court to sign an order that "records are material and relevant" has not been submitted for perusal by the House. We have not been informed of the materiality and the relevancy of the required documents.

Are these records relevant? If they are, what are they relevant to? The resolution requests to examine records for 3 years. Is this relevant to an alleged crime that has been committed in a single moment? Should not copies of this affidavit have been produced so that the House might have known whether its requirements were fairly and accurately stated to the court? Only on perusal of the affidavit would we know whether the judge acted in accordance with the constitutional privileges of the Members of the House, and whether the Members of the House are adequately protected. It is obvious that if the House cannot see the affidavit it cannot know what representations were made to the court.

Furthermore, House Resolution 279 states that there is a criminal action being prosecuted by the people of the State of New York against ADAM CLAYTON POWELL. The House has been misinformed. The subpoena served on Bertha Klausner, a witness called before the grand jury, recited that the proceeding was People against "John Doe." The grand jury has been serving John Doe subpoenas on all witnesses. It appears from the information given the House of Representatives that the criminal charge has been converted from the People of the State of New York against John Doe to the People of the State of New York against ADAM CLAYTON POWELL. But no case is pending in the New York courts of the People of the State of New York against ADAM CLAYTON POWELL.

The present criminal investigation is frivolous with no other purpose than harassment. The grand jury has been investigating a misdemeanor. In the State of New York a grand jury has never been used for the indictment of a misdemeanor. A grand jury would not ordinarily be called to investigate a Member here if he spit on the street. Yet, to prove the harassment involved in the present proceeding, let me point out that the grand jury has been investigating "John Doe" 4 or 5 months without having returned a true bill.

For the protection of its Members, the House should make an inquiry into the reason for the present investigatory proceedings against "John Doe," who just might be a Member of this body possessed of the privilege of the House. In the city of New York, when grand jury investigations have merit, the grand jury does not usually take more than 2 or 3 hours to make a determination. This is a very strange and unusual proceeding which the grand jury is conducting concerning "John Doe," and since it may be criminal in form but not in substance, the House should inquire into the question of whether the investigation by the grand jury of "John Doe" constitutes a real and bona fide effort to substantiate a charge already pending or whether it is an investigation for the purpose of finding a charge to place against a Member of this body.

The purpose of a grand jury is to investigate an allegation that a crime has been committed. Its purpose is never to decide in advance that a crime has been committed and then to look around for evidence to substantiate such decision. The House should not condone or approve or aid or assist in the fulfillment of this purpose. Nor should it allow its Members to be harassed by frivolous matters. The indictment of "John Doe" presently pending in the criminal courts of the State of New York does not even charge a crime. It charges that "John Doe" gave his wife \$900. This is not a crime in the State of New York, or in any State in this Union.

Because of the matters at stake in this cause, I counsel the Members here to be careful of their rights where this type of impairment of privilege is involved, lest it solidify into a common practice and deny the Members of the House the unencumbered right to attend to their duties.

I therefore urge, for the protection of the Members of this body against the mischievous use of legal processes to invade their privileges or render them meaningless, that the House investigate these matters and I ask the Speaker's courtesy to suspend all proceedings under the resolution until such inquiry has been concluded.

VICE PRESIDENT HUMPHREY SHOULD BE SENT TO INDIA AND PAKISTAN TO RESTORE GOOD RELATIONS

Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MORSE] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, on Monday I joined 11 Republican Members of the House in proposing that Vice President HUMPHREY be sent to India and Pakistan to attempt to restore good relations with those nations in advance of the SEATO foreign ministers meeting beginning in London next Monday.

Congressmen ANDREWS of North Dakota, BROOMFIELD, ELLSWORTH, FRELINGHUYSEN, HORTON, LINDSAY, MATHIAS, MCDADE, MOSHER, REID, and TUPPER believe as I do that the abrupt postponement of the impending visits of the heads of government of those two nations constitutes an unfortunate example of insensitivity in the conduct of U.S. foreign affairs.

Yesterday in the New York Times there appeared a letter from Mr. H. R. Vohra, the Washington correspondent of the Times of India. Mr. Vohra pointed out how unfortunate the timing of this administration action was in light of Prime Minister Shastri's proposed visit to Moscow in May, and the current harmony in United States-Indian relations. In his words:

The withdrawal of the invitation by our rules of hospitality seemed not only ill-mannered, but political ill-conceived.

I would like to call the attention of the House to the full text of the statement issued on Monday and to the letter of Mr. Vohra by including them in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD following my remarks:

STATEMENT ON CANCELLATION OF INDIAN AND PAKISTAN VISITS

We propose that Vice President HUMPHREY be sent immediately on a mission to India and Pakistan to assure friendly relations between the United States and these two nations. We urge the administration to explore promptly with the governments involved the possibility of such a trip as evidence of deep American concern over current misunderstanding.

The administration's sudden cancellation of the impending visits of President Ayub Khan of Pakistan and Prime Minister Lal Bahadur Shastri of India is an unfortunate example of insensitivity in the conduct of U.S. foreign affairs. While the administration certainly did not intend to insult either nation or their leaders the timing and means of the cancellation may have undermined American influence in Asia. Even the best of diplomatic purposes and policies can be ill-served by clumsy diplomatic practices and timing.

The visit of President Ayub Khan of Pakistan was cancelled only 9 days before it was to begin and only 17 days before the crucial SEATO foreign ministers conference in London on May 3. Thus President Johnson denied himself the opportunity to use his considerable persuasive abilities on the Pakistani leader immediately in advance of the London meeting.

The June visit of Prime Minister Shastri of India was cancelled within a few days after its itinerary had been made public. As a result, the Indian Government may be less inclined to respect American leadership. It has already issued a stinging denunciation of U.S. policy in Vietnam.

The reasons given publicly by the administration for the cancellation are insufficient. The pace of congressional business should never be allowed to dictate foreign policy. And while the President may be preoccupied with problems in Vietnam, so are most of the world's leaders. Surely American policy in Vietnam is directly affected by U.S. relations with all the countries of Asia.

An early visit by Vice President HUMPHREY to Pakistan and India could demonstrate that the administration intended no slight. It could facilitate a better understanding of U.S. policy in Vietnam. It could be a valuable diplomatic initiative in advance of the SEATO conference in early May. And it might also provide an opportunity to improve relations between the two countries themselves.

WITHDRAWAL OF INDIA'S INVITATION CRITICIZED
To the Editor:

Indian reporters (and I am one of them) whose task it is to interpret the changing moods and problems of this country have found it difficult to explain to our readers at home how so practiced a President could be so brusque in his treatment of an elected Prime Minister of the world's largest democracy.

I have been at a loss how to sell the official explanation that the President's load has so increased that the invitation he issued in the last week of March had to be withdrawn in the third week of April.

The difficulty was augmented when, necessarily, one viewed the official explanation in the lucid light of facts. No President in recent history, so one is told, has had an easier time with Congress. In any case, between March and April, nothing new has happened to add to the President's troubles and much has happened to establish that he can continue to rely on Congress to do his bidding.

The explanation about Vietnam relates to a chronic situation which has existed for months.

Reluctantly one came to the conclusion that there was more to it than meets the eye. It gave Indians no satisfaction that our Prime Minister should be equated even in the implied (or unwitting) discourtesy with Field Marshal Ayub Khan.

The Indian Ambassador sought an explanation of the debacle. Secretary Rusk tried to mollify Indian feelings, so it is reported, by reminding him that the Senate Foreign Relations Committee at one stage had cut \$100 million from the aid authorization bill to mark its displeasure against two warring neighbors—India and Pakistan. The implication was that India and Pakistan should be grateful for the withdrawal of the invitations. The President, by this master stroke, was providing both with assured aid. It was better to have aid than to be invited.

POLITICALLY ILL CONCEIVED

The withdrawal of the invitation by our rules of hospitality seemed not only ill-mannered, but politically ill conceived. Mr. Shastri was due to visit Moscow in May. In the past Moscow has sought to exploit every reverse in Indo-United States relations. It filled the gap when the United States faltered on the Bokaro project. It gave India MIG's when the United States hesitated on F-104's.

The disinclination now leaves Mr. Shastri in an unbalanced political posture when he was anxious to correct it by a visit to this country. It would have been in the mutual interest of the United States and India that this should happen early.

The postponement, inexplicably, came at a moment when Indo-United States relations had achieved an unaccustomed harmony—the greatest source of harmony being the mutual understanding on Chinese communism and India's sworn determination to serve as a bulwark against its machinations across a 2,000-mile-long border. For the responsibility we bear in this matter at tremendous sacrifice to ourselves, we seek no reward. But, surely there is scope to recognize the difference between the Indian outlook and the Pakistani stand on Peking. This difference makes the balancing between India and Pakistan a particularly ugly spectacle.

Let me make one final point to explain why Indian reaction to the postponement has been sharp. It is not the postponement which matters much but the way it was carried out.

There was no consultation, as far as I can make out, between the President and India's Prime Minister prior to the postponement. He was merely handed a letter asking to call

later. The indelicate procedure adopted made the postponement doubly galling.

H. R. VOHRA,
Washington Correspondent, the Times
of India.
WASHINGTON, April 24, 1965.

ANNIVERSARY OF ARMENIAN
MASSACRE

Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. LIPSCOMB] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, the tragic fate of the Armenian people in Turkey in 1915 stands out as the saddest and most unforgettable event of the First World War. This involved the lives of 2 million industrious, enterprising, intelligent, and prosperous people. In this wholesale and indiscriminate massacre, secretly planned and carefully concealed from the public until after the outbreak of the war, no one was to be spared from this ghastly holocaust.

Certain Turkish authorities had decided that for the alleged disloyalty of some Armenian leaders, all Armenians, irrespective of age and sex, had to pay with their lives. It is this aspect of the tragedy, the deliberate massacre of more than 1 million innocent and helpless Armenians under circumstances seldom recorded in the annals of history, that makes this crime against humanity and civilization stand out.

In the course of less than a year these Turks had done their very worst to finish this task. The large community of 2 million Armenians in Turkey was no more. It had ceased to exist. More than 1 million lost their lives in outright massacres and through starvation. Women and children by the hundreds of thousands were sold into slavery, to the Turks, Kurds, and Arabs. Some were lucky enough to save their lives by finding refuge in neighboring countries, and only the Armenians in Constantinople—today's Istanbul—were spared from this national scourge through the efforts of the U.S. Ambassador.

The United States is fortunate in that many Armenians have chosen to come here to establish new homes for themselves and their families. The Armenians have made many significant contributions to America. They are industrious and hardworking, and are fine citizens dedicated to advancing the welfare of their communities and their Nation.

This year marks the 50th anniversary of the sad event, the national tragedy of Armenians in Turkey. Armenians and their friends here and elsewhere observe this anniversary and mourn the tragic loss.

RESOLUTIONS OF THE STATE OF
ILLINOIS ON LITHUANIAN INDEPENDENCE

Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent

that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DERWINSKI] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, 47 years ago Lithuania reestablished itself as a completely free sovereign state, and for 21 years the citizens made great progress under a stable, effective government.

Since 1940 the Soviet Union has held Lithuania in bondage; however, we in the United States have not forgotten the plight of the Lithuanian people and rededicate ourselves to the reestablishment of an independent Lithuania.

Therefore, I call to the attention of the Members resolutions adopted by the Illinois Senate and Illinois House of Representatives, which I insert in the RECORD at this point:

HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 12

Whereas this year marks the 47th year since the date the country of Lithuania regained status as an independent nation; and

Whereas Illinois citizens of Lithuanian descent are observing Lithuanian Independence Day on February 16; and

Whereas 20 years after World War II, Lithuania is still occupied and controlled by the Soviet Union contrary to international law and the will of the Lithuanian nation; and

Whereas the people of this State and Nation of Lithuanian ancestry have contributed much to the fiber of our society and the accomplishments of America as a whole: Therefore be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the 74th General Assembly of the State of Illinois (the Senate concurring herein), That we salute the Lithuanian people and extend our hope that their nation will again regain its independence; and that the people in this State and Nation of Lithuanian ancestry be congratulated for the contributions they have made for the preservation of freedom and to the greatness of this country.

Adopted by the house, February 3, 1965.

JOHN P. TOUHY,
Speaker of House.

CHAS. F. KERVIN,
Clerk of the House.

Concurred in by the senate, February 9, 1965.

SAMUEL H. SHAPIRO,
President of the Senate.
EDWARD E. FERNANDES,
Secretary of the Senate.

SENATE RESOLUTION 24

Whereas this year marks the 47th year since the date the country of Lithuania regained status as an independent nation; and

Whereas Illinois citizens of Lithuanian descent are observing Lithuanian Independence Day on February 16; and

Whereas, 20 years after World War II, Lithuania is still occupied and controlled by the Soviet Union contrary to international law and the will of the Lithuanian nation; and

Whereas the people of this State and Nation of Lithuanian ancestry have contributed much to the fiber of our society and the accomplishments of America as a whole: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Senate of 74th General Assembly of the State of Illinois, That we salute the Lithuanian people and extend our hope that their nation will again regain its independence; and that the people in this State and Nation of Lithuanian ancestry be congratulated for the contributions they have

made for the preservation of freedom and to the greatness of this country.

Adopted by the senate, February 3, 1965.

SAMUEL H. SHAPIRO,
President of the Senate.
EDWARD E. FERNANDES,
Secretary of the Senate.

Mr. Speaker, the Illinois Senate and Illinois House passed these respective resolutions unanimously. It is indeed stimulating to note the dramatic fashion in which these Illinois legislators have commemorated the anniversary of Lithuanian independence.

URGENTLY NEEDED: EXPANDED VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION HOSPITAL FACILITIES

Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Washington [Mr. PELLY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, it is my understanding that there is some thought being given to enlarging certain Veterans' Administration hospitals in the near future.

In this regard, I should like to bring to the attention of my colleagues the situation existing at the Veterans' Administration in Seattle, where, in my opinion, the need for expansion is desperate. I am sure that the Seattle VA hospital is only one of many in similar circumstances.

Recently, I received an urgent request from one of my constituents whose father, a veteran, is presently in a hospital where the cost for care is \$50 a day. Inasmuch as the family has but a very small income, it is easy to see how such care is imposing a definite hardship on the family. My constituent asked that I do what I could to get her father transferred to the VA hospital, stating that the family had tried, but found that no space would be available until about the middle of next month.

In checking with the hospital, I found that the facts given by my constituent were quite correct. The hospital presently has a waiting list of 16 urgent cases, some of the patients being hospitalized elsewhere, and at least one instance where private hospitalization has used up just about all the patient's finances.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that a situation like this is positive indication that the proposal to enlarge VA hospitals should be made a definite project—and just as soon as possible. Our veterans deserve the gratitude of all Americans for the service they have rendered their country, and in my opinion, one of the best ways to express our gratitude is to assure that sufficient hospital space is available when the time comes that they have to call upon us for assistance.

I sincerely hope that expeditious action will be taken. Every day that passes with nothing being done to improve conditions at our VA hospitals adds to the

urgency of the issue, and imposes additional strain and suffering on those waiting for the care to which they are entitled.

THE INEQUITY IN FINANCING SOCIAL SECURITY

Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. MARTIN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, earlier this month the House acted on the Social Security Amendments of 1965, H.R. 6675. On the two rollcall votes concerned with the final passage of this legislation, I voted in favor of the Republican substitute and against the majority bill which included the compulsory medicare plan financed by a regressive payroll tax.

At the time of the debate I said:

I object to medicare because it is needlessly compulsory and because it is financed by a regressive payroll tax that will reduce the take-home pay of many people who cannot afford to pay additional taxes. * * * I also share the view expressed today that the inclusion of service-type benefits in the social security program may impair the ability to meet future cash benefit obligations.

It is in part because of my business background that I am gravely concerned over the payroll tax burdens that will result from this bill. We are proposing to take almost \$5 billion more in taxes next year just for social security purposes. The present \$17 billion that we now collect in social security taxes will almost double by 1972 and the total will continue to mount after that.

During my remarks on the House floor, I associated myself with the able expression of additional separate views by my colleague, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BROYHILL], who serves as a member of the Committee on Ways and Means, as his views are set forth in the committee report beginning on page 258. Mr. BROYHILL and I were among the co-sponsors of the eldercare approach to meeting the health needs of our senior citizens under a voluntary program made available to those individuals requiring Government assistance. In his views, Mr. BROYHILL called attention to the fact that with the medicare proposal we were adding many billions of dollars to the more than \$300 billion of existing unfunded obligations of the OASDI system. It was pointed out this unfunded condition of the system would mean that the younger and future members of our working population would be subjected to the inequity of having to pay not only the cost of their own benefits, but also the cost of beneficiaries who had preceded them in the program.

Mr. Speaker, as our young citizens become aware of the fact that social security is not the bargain it now appears, we will find a growing resentment developing with respect to the prodigality with which we have approached our responsibilities in financing social security. When this realization comes, we will find

more sound than soundness in regard to social security financing. In this connection, it should be borne in mind that it is not a question of whether a Member is for or against the old people when he stands for a social security system that is responsibly financed. Indeed, the converse is true. A willingness to underfinance social security is a measure of the extent to which a Member of Congress is willing to go in imposing our tax burdens on the next generation.

Mr. Speaker, in the current issue of *Barron's*, there is an article captioned "Robbing Peter—A Critical Look at the Pending Social Security Bill." It comments on the financing aspects of social security. This article should be read by every American who has any interest in keeping our social security system on a sound basis. Accordingly, I include this article as a part of my remarks at this point in the RECORD:

ROBBING PETER—A CRITICAL LOOK AT THE PENDING SOCIAL SECURITY BILL

(By Shirley Scheibla)

WASHINGTON.—"Because social security recipients have been getting benefits 10 times as great as what they have paid in, people seem to think we have a special machine here which turns out \$10 bills for \$1 bills," says a top official of the Social Security Administration.

Since the SSA possesses no such wondrous device, it is counting on future contributions in excess of benefits to make ends meet for its old-age, survivors, and disability insurance. The present benefits-contributions ratio will grow even more unfavorable if the Senate enacts the social security bill, H.R. 6675, recently passed by the House.

The benefit-payment ratio for persons already retired obviously is responsible for much of the enthusiasm for the bill, which contains not only medicare but also a 7-percent increase in cash benefits. Retirement contributions, however, have been stepped up even more.

PUBLIC IGNORANCE

Says one official: "Continued general support for the social security system hinges on continued public ignorance of how the system works." He adds: "I believe that we have nothing to worry about because it is so enormously complex that nobody is going to figure it out."

Barron's hereby takes on the job.

The SSA worked up the following table, which purports to show that benefits in every age group exceed contributions.

| | Retiree age 71 | Worker now age 50 | 18-year- old future worker |
|-------------------------------|-------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| Total contribution..... | \$1,290 | \$5,832 | \$10,212 |
| Retirement benefits..... | 13,422 | 14,094 | 14,205 |
| Wife's and widow's benefits.. | 9,363 | 9,831 | 9,909 |
| Total benefits..... | 22,785 | 23,925 | 24,114 |

The table warrants close scrutiny. Based on maximum contributions and benefits, it includes only amounts paid by employees, even though employers pay matching amounts for their benefit. It also excludes interest which the money could have earned for the contributors if it had not been tied up in social security funds.

This approach, however, is far from realistic. To cover the true situation, the table would obviously have to include both interest and the employer's contribution. Starting with the 71-year-old retiree, and calculating interest at 3 percent (approximately the average national rate during the period of his contributions) would produce a figure of

\$3,373, against benefits of \$22,785. Actuarially, he can expect to live to 79 to collect this amount. The 7-percent increase in cash benefits under H.R. 6675 would raise his benefits to \$24,379. His contributions, of course, would not thereby increase, since he no longer makes any.

As for the 50-year-old worker, by including the employer contribution and interest at 3 percent during 1960 and 4¼ percent thereafter (again, the national average for the period) his total payments come to \$22,856, against benefits of \$23,925—if he lives long enough. The actuarial table used by the Internal Revenue Service for taxing annuities indicates he can expect to live to only 75½, whereas SSA has assumed he will live to 79.

The new bill would require this worker and his employer to contribute an extra \$4,240 for retirement. At the same time, the bill's 7-percent increase in cash benefits would mean \$1,667 for him. Thus, if H.R. 6675 becomes law, the 50-year-old worker can expect to make contributions of \$26,012, including interest, against benefits of \$25,592.

As for the 18-year-old, including the employer's contribution and figuring interest at 4¼ percent for the latter's 46-year working life (assumed by SSA) gives a total of \$61,596, against \$24,114 in benefits. For this contribution the worker could purchase from a private company a monthly annuity of \$463 for life, after retirement. His maximum benefit under social security would be \$254 a month.

MONTHLY ANNUITY

Under the new bill bill, H.R. 6675, employer-employees retirement contributions for the 18-year-old with 4¼ percent interest, would come to \$84,300. The 7 percent increase in cash benefits would bring the latter to only \$25,802. For this amount, the worker could purchase from a private company a monthly annuity of \$634 for life. His maximum benefit under social security would be \$312 a month.

The benefits figured may be high under both present law and the pension bill because SSA has assumed the youngster will retire at 67 and live to the ripe old age of 79. But the Internal Revenue Service actuarial table assumes that an 18-year-old today can expect to live to only 71.9. SSA in any case, has adopted a policy of robbing Peter to pay Paul.

Obviously, those who are urging Congress to be still more generous are thinking chiefly of people already retired or close to retirement. Few of these enthusiasts realize, however, that OASDI has been in operation for only 28 years and that therefore no one has paid social security taxes for his whole working life of 46 years. The system took in an additional 10 million people as recently as 1951, when new legislation covered farm and domestic workers. Another 7½ million members were added only 10 years ago, when coverage was extended to some self-employed. H.R. 6675 would take in still others, including waiters and additional professional workers.

A REAL BONANZA

For the 20 million retirees collecting today, social security is a real bonanza. For those who turned 65 a few years after entering the system, it represents a windfall. For new workers, however, today's largesse will be a crushing burden because, in order to pay Paul, SSA must rob Peter.

Neither SSA officials nor members of the Ways and Means Committee make any bones about the prospect that future contributions will pay the bill. This, they point out, is the great difference between social insurance and private pension plans.

The latter should have enough in the till to fulfill all obligations without counting on any new entrants. But under a compulsory system, the experts explain, they can count on the taxes on new workers coming into the system. SSA officials insist that an em-

ployer's social security taxes are for the social good, not for the individual good of the worker on whose earnings they are based.

Whether SSA will be able to sell this idea remains to be seen. Ray M. Peterson, vice president and associate actuary of the Equitable Life Assurance Society, has his doubts. Says he: "We may expect from sophisticated, market-oriented employers, and from labor union experts increasing dissatisfaction with the disparity between what OASDI promises and what could be secured under a private plan."

Some dissatisfaction already is becoming apparent. Students at Northern Illinois University have formed a young citizens council, to combat exploitation of young taxpayers under the social security program. Commented the Chicago Tribune: "They think it only fair that the young taxpayer who is getting set on a job and starting to raise a family should pay lower social security taxes than older persons who have to pay only a few years before they start receiving benefits."

Nobody knows the exact debt young workers will have to pay. Back in 1962, when the SSA last figured out its unfunded liability for OASDI, it totaled \$321 billion. Now the experts think it may come to \$330 billion or more. Just for present members, according to SSA officials, passage of H.R. 6675 would mean an additional liability of \$40 to \$50 billion for increased cash benefits and another \$35 billion for medicare.

At the end of last year the old-age and survivors insurance trust fund totaled \$19.1 billion, compared with a high of \$22.5 billion 8 years ago.

The story is even worse for the disability insurance fund. When Congress created it in 1956 to finance disability payments, authorized then for the first time, much was made of the fact that the disability insurance fund was set up separately from the OASI fund. Congress developed a habit, however, of enlarging disability benefits more than it enlarged the fund. Last year disbursements exceeded receipts by \$188 million, and the fund shrank to \$2 billion at the end of the year. By 1969, under present law, it is expected to fall to \$81 million.

The following table shows how the combined unfunded liability has increased since 1956:

(In billions of dollars)

| | Taxes plus trust funds | Value of benefits | Unfunded liability |
|---------------|---------------------------|----------------------|-----------------------|
| 1956 act..... | 217 | 486 | 269 |
| 1958 act..... | 254 | 543 | 289 |
| 1960 act..... | 276 | 587 | 311 |
| 1961 act..... | 304 | 625 | 321 |

INCREASED BENEFITS

The unfunded liability has risen even though both the tax rate and the taxable earnings base have grown over the years. One difficulty, of course, is that each time Congress raises contributions, it also increases benefits.

When the system started out in 1937, the maximum earnings base was a mere \$3,000, and employer and employee each paid a tax of 1 percent. The rate was to go up to 1½ percent each in 1940, to 2 percent in 1943, 2½ percent in 1946, and 3 percent in 1949. To reduce the burden of social security during World War II, however, Congress temporarily suspended the scheduled increases. By 1950 the combined tax went to 3 percent, and the following year the base went up to \$3,600. In 1954 the rate rose to 4 percent, and the following year the base rose to \$4,200. In 1956 Congress provided for the first cash benefits for disability, and the following year the rate went up to 4½ percent. In 1959 the rate became 5 percent, and the base \$4,800. The next year, the rate increased to

6 percent. Another quarter percent was added in 1962. In 1963 it went up to 7½ percent.

Congress has always felt that the tax rate must not exceed 10 percent. This ceiling however, has been pierced in H.R. 6675. The following tables show what would happen to the combined tax rate and maximum contributions, under present law and under H.R. 6675.

Combined employer-employee contribution
(In percent)

| Year | Present law | H.R. 6675 | Amount ¹ |
|----------------|-------------|-----------|---------------------|
| 1965 | 7.25 | 7.25 | ----- |
| 1966 | 8.25 | 8.70 | 0.70 |
| 1967 | 8.25 | 9.00 | 1.00 |
| 1968 | 9.25 | 9.00 | 1.00 |
| 1969-70 | 9.25 | 9.80 | 1.00 |
| 1971-72 | 9.25 | 9.80 | 1.00 |
| 1973-75 | 9.25 | 10.70 | 1.10 |
| 1976-79 | 9.25 | 10.80 | 1.20 |
| 1980-86 | 9.25 | 11.00 | 1.40 |
| 1987 and after | 9.25 | 11.20 | 1.60 |

¹ Portion of H.R. 6675 tax required for basic health insurance program.

Combined maximum contributions

| Year | Present law | H.R. 6675 without medicare | H.R. 6675 with medicare |
|---------|-------------|----------------------------|-------------------------|
| 1965 | \$348 | \$348.00 | \$348.00 |
| 1966 | 396 | 448.00 | 487.20 |
| 1967 | 396 | 448.00 | 507.00 |
| 1968 | 444 | 448.00 | 504.00 |
| 1969-70 | 444 | 492.80 | 548.80 |
| 1971-72 | 444 | 580.80 | 616.80 |
| 1973-75 | 444 | 633.60 | 706.20 |
| 1976-79 | 444 | 633.60 | 712.80 |
| 1980-86 | 444 | 633.60 | 726.00 |
| 1987 on | 444 | 633.60 | 739.20 |

Even these contributions do not assure the actuarial soundness of social security. In its last annual report, the board of trustees figured things out on the basis of high, low, and intermediate cost estimates, and on both a 75-year and perpetuity basis.

On a high-cost and perpetuity basis, benefits will come to 10.83 percent of payroll, and contributions will total 9.11 percent, producing an actuarial imbalance of 1.72 percent. On the intermediate cost estimate, however, contributions will total 9.11 percent and benefits 9.35 percent, leaving an imbalance of 0.24 percent, just within the limit of 0.25 percent which Congress has considered acceptable. Figured on a 75-year rather than a perpetuity basis and on intermediate costs, contributions will total 9.10 percent and benefits 9.09 percent, leaving the minuscule positive balance of 0.01 percent. With low costs and a 75-year basis, it is possible to show a positive balance of 1.13 percent. The figures, in short, can be juggled to show whatever one wants.

The Ways and Means Committee has chosen the figures which show a positive balance of 0.01 percent. It says H.R. 6675 would shift this "to a lack of balance of 0.08 percent, which is below the established limit within which the system is considered substantially in actuarial balance."

However, if the past is any key to the future, contributions will have to rise and liberalizing of benefits will follow, in a dizzy spiral. As employers' social security payroll taxes go up, their operating costs will rise. With increasing amounts deducted for social security, employees are likely to ask for wage increases to maintain their take-home pay. Faced with these twin developments, employers probably will raise prices. With higher prices, however, social security checks won't go so far, and beneficiaries again presumably will pressure Congress to boost monthly benefits.

In H.R. 6675 Congress seems to feel that it can slow down this process by giving up

financing solely through social security taxes. For persons over 65 who are not eligible for medicare benefits from the general funds of the Treasury, the latter also would be used to match \$3 monthly benefits; it would finance voluntary contributions from persons over 65 who want insurance to cover doctor bills.

Some observers feel that the introduction of general Government contributions is the first crack in the dike of financial controls maintained by payroll taxes. They expect some future Congress to decide that if workers and employers object to more than a 10-percent levy, the Government could keep on liberalizing social security and make up the difference from the Treasury's general funds.

SSA officials maintain, however, that there is a limit to how much the social security system can obtain from the latter source without necessitating an increase in the income tax.

The Ways and Means Committee has made much of the fact that H.R. 6675 sets up a separate fund for medicare benefits. Representative GERALD R. FORD, Republican, of Michigan, contended during the floor debate on H.R. 6675, however, that the trust funds will not be inviolate. "I need only point out to you that in this bill now before us is a provision increasing the allocation of funds to the disability trust fund to the detriment of the OASI fund," he declared.

Congress is as aware as anyone that there is no such thing as a free lunch—or free retirement or medical benefits. It is, however, much more concerned with the voters of today than with the youngsters who will pay their bills in the future.

This is an appropriate time, then, to recall what the Ways and Means Committee said 10 years ago: "We should take sober warning that, in our zeal to provide ever-greater benefits and to provide against an ever-wider area of need, we do not destroy the very system which we have created."

OBSERVANCE OF 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF MASSACRE OF ARMENIANS BY THE TURKS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DERWINSKI] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, 50 years ago this week the Turkish atrocities and mass murders against the Armenian population of the then Ottoman Empire commenced. The slaughter by the Turks of the helpless Armenian civilian population was the first great genocide of modern times.

I call upon the Armenians throughout the United States to expand their program of commemorating the 50th anniversary of the Turkish genocide of the Armenians not only to develop proper world opinion in support of justice which the Armenian people have not received but also to point out the unpunished Turkish genocide, a precedent which has resulted in the slaughter of additional millions of people in struggles since that time.

Just 6 years ago the people of Tibet were the victims of Chinese Communist genocide, and the world was silent just as the world was silent during the deliberate famines created by the Soviet Government against non-Russian peoples of the U.S.S.R. in the 1920's and 1930's.

The acts of genocide perpetrated by the Nazis during World War II might not have occurred had world justice been applied against the Turks in 1915. The postwar acts of genocide by the Soviet Union against the Baltic peoples could have been averted had world justice moved to support the Armenians in 1915.

On Monday in the House of Representatives Archbishop Hrant Katchadourian, prelate of the Armenian National Apostolic Church of North America, delivered the invocation. This afternoon Archbishop Katchadourian delivered the invocation in the other body. He signifies the united, active participation of the American Armenian community in commemorative events in observance of the great tragedy that befell the Armenian nation.

Last Sunday evening in Boston the commemorative committee on the 50th anniversary of the Turkish genocide of the Armenians sponsored a banquet in Cambridge, Mass. The main address was delivered by Prof. Setrak Benjamin Minas, national chairman of the commemorative committee. I include his address in the RECORD at this point as part of my remarks:

SPEECH BY PROF. SETRAK BENJAMIN MINAS, NATIONAL CHAIRMAN OF THE COMMEMORATIVE COMMITTEE, ON THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE TURKISH GENOCIDE OF THE ARMENIANS

In April 1915 the Turkish Government began the planned mass murder of the Armenian people. This marked the 1st act of genocide in the 20th century. Over 300 years of periodic massacres and pillage and constant oppression culminated in the indiscriminate murder of 1½ million Armenians in 1915, and the deportation of over 1 million more under conditions so incredibly inhuman as to shock the sensibilities of the civilized world. All Armenian property was confiscated or destroyed.

Thus the 20th century began with this massive attempt to murder and to exterminate an entire people; an attempt to obliterate its entire culture; and did rob the Armenians of their entire material wealth. Never before, in the memory of living men had a crime of such enormity and viciousness been conceived and executed by a government. Of this appalling subhuman crime, the Government of Turkey in 1915 stands condemned, but unpunished, by documented history.

I refer to the book entitled "The Treatment of Armenians in the Ottoman Empire," published by the Houses of the British Parliament as an official paper. I quote from page 653:

"In one way or another, the Central Government (of Turkey) enforced and controlled the execution of the scheme, as it alone had originated the conception of it; and the Young Turkish Ministers and their associates at Constantinople are directly responsible, from beginning to end, for the gigantic crime that devastated the Near East in 1915."

Impartial history places the blame for this horrendous crime on the Turkish Government of 1915. This shocking tragedy is further compounded in 1965, when the Turkish representative in the United Nations and current Turkish news releases refer to this mass murder as the "alleged massacres

of the Armenians," and then Turkey plausibly declares "the act of genocide can never be excused."

When the Turkish Government of 1965 attempts to pervert documented history, it discloses a studied ignorance and indifference that leads one to agree with the words of Viscount Bryce, "Can anyone still continue to hope that the evils of such a government are curable?" It is this Turkish Government that is allowed to sit as a member in the United Nations, and is permitted to use a civilized forum to express and to perpetuate its uncivilized character. The United Nations was established by civilized nations with the moral purpose of replacing the rule of force with the rule of law. An organization with a moral purpose cannot permit the membership of an amoral nation. The Turkish Government should sit in the defendants dock accused of a heinous crime, and not as a member of an organization seeking to act as a moral force. This travesty of logic and morality reduces this potentially great organization to a sham and a mockery. The United Nations must take a firm position on the side of good against evil. In the words of a great American, "Nonconformance with evil is just as important as conformance with good." If the majority of the member nations in the United Nations do not subscribe to international morality and justice, the minority of the member nations ought to resign their participation; if the majority of the member nations firmly believe in equal justice for all peoples, then it is their duty to courageously guide the United Nations to the achievement of its moral purpose.

In 1915, Talaat Pasha, Turkish Minister of the Interior and one of the chief architects of the genocide of the Armenian people, declared, "We will give the Armenians such a blow that there will be no Armenian Question for fifty years."

The year 1965 marks the end of the fifty years. Talaat Pasha is dead! The Armenian Question remains alive! One and one-half million Armenian voices were forever stilled in 1915—but in 1965, the resonant voices of their children and grandchildren ring out to remind the civilized world of the Turkish crime that defies human comprehension; to remind the civilized nations that the Armenian Question is still on the agenda of unfinished business.

For 600 years the Turkish Government attempted to destroy the identity of the Armenian people. But, the Armenian and his culture still live. Because the Armenian has always placed himself on the side of good against evil, he has become the indestructible Armenian.

The Turk of 1965 has inherited a legacy of guilt. The Armenian has inherited a legacy of noble adherence to God and to the Right. It is this noble heritage that makes the Armenian indestructible.

The indestructible Armenian on this Memorial Day declares that no nation or combination of nations has the legal or moral license to deny him his sovereign rights. As Pope John XXIII said in his "Pacem in Terris," the rights of men and governments stem not solely from human consent, but from the design of the Creator. The sovereign rights of the Armenian stemming from "the design of the Creator" cannot be abrogated by the Treaty of Lausanne. That which has been bestowed by God, only God can take away.

The avowed purpose of all civilized nations is to secure a universal peace which still remains beyond their grasp. The Armenian people would remind the free world that the only basis of a universal peace is the establishment of the principle of equal justice under the law, to be applied to the rights of all peoples. There can be no segregation in the application of human rights.

In the gigantic confrontation today of the forces of the free world, and the forces of evil, hundreds of millions of people stand uncommitted to one side or the other. Each side condemns their neutrality. It is not understood that these peoples are not being given the choice between good and evil, but only a choice between conflicting military power. Their posture of neutrality holds for them less danger than a choice that might become disastrous by the unpredictable shifts of modern weaponry. The neutral nations are wooed with money, when it is the morality of the Wilsonian doctrine they are seeking.

The Armenian question is the oldest unsettled business of the civilized world. I submit that if the Armenian case were reopened today and a just verdict were rendered, a long-lost faith would be rekindled in the hearts of the neutral peoples giving them the courage to arrange themselves on the side of good and the free world.

The disease infecting the free world today is lack of courage. It requires more courage to seek peace than to wage war; more courage is demanded to administer equal justice under the law, than to bow before the demands of political expediency.

The prerequisite of justice—unshakable courage. To stand for right against wrong.

The indestructible Armenian will continue to remind the world that genocide is a crime against the law of God—and remains a crime whether the nations of the world ratify or ignore the convention of genocide.

The indestructible Armenian, in defense of civilization, and in defense of his inalienable rights, will continue to appeal to the conscience of the free world for a just solution of the Armenian case.

The salvation of the human race lies in the renaissance of that conscience.

Mr. McCLODY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DERWINSKI. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. McCLODY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I want to commend the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DERWINSKI] for calling the attention of this House and of the Nation to the subject of this 50th observance of the massacre of the Armenians. I want to associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman and congratulate him for his work in this behalf as well as in behalf of freedom-loving peoples throughout the world.

Also, I want to commend the gentleman for his sponsorship and his leadership in the matter of the Captive Nations Resolution and all of the other great freedom-seeking efforts in which the gentleman has taken part.

I take particular interest in this subject because of a large Armenian community in the district which I represent, particularly in the area of Waukegan in Lake County, Ill., and the very fine citizens of Armenian descent who now occupy positions of leadership in the business, civic and political life of the congressional district which I serve. I direct attention, for instance, to the distinguished mayor of the city of Waukegan, a gentleman by the name of Robert Sabonian, who is of Armenian descent. There are also many other public, civic, and business leaders in this area, of Armenian birth or descent, who have gained the respect of the entire community and who are intensely interested in the matter of this 50th observance. I am proud to join with them and with

the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DERWINSKI] in paying respect to the Armenian nation which some day, we hope, will be restored to full identity and full statehood.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. McCLODY] for his pertinent comments and point out to the Members of the House that in addition to his very busy legislative schedule, he has been especially helpful in cooperating in the Illinois area with commemorative events this year.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DERWINSKI. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I thank my able colleague from Illinois for yielding to me. I wish to commend the gentleman for having had set aside this time today that the Members of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States could express our undying friendship for those of Armenian blood or descent and our sympathy for those who suffered cruelly in the tragedy of a half a century ago. That tragedy I remember so vividly, for a member of one of the Armenian families numbered among its victims escaped to the United States and was in my office.

Mr. Speaker, the men and women of Armenia during the wars have had a strong faith, an abiding faith, in God.

Among the unspeakable horrors and terrifying deeds of the First World War, the massacre of more than 1 million helpless and innocent Armenians in Turkey stands as the foulest crime. It was not caused by the war, although the war did provide the setting in which the foul act could be carried out with impunity. For the war tied the hands of all friends of the Armenian people, and no sympathetic European government could help them in their gravest national crisis.

Historic Armenia was conquered by Ottoman Turks more than 400 years ago, and Armenians thus became Ottoman subjects in their homeland. There they lived under oppressive alien rule, and were also subjected to pillage and plunder by other peoples, especially the wild and unruly Kurds. During all that time, helpless and unarmed Armenians were at the mercy of these lawless elements, for the Turkish Government made no effort to check such lawlessness on the part of its unruly subjects. Year after year Armenians complained of these outrages to the government, of the physical violence committed by the Kurds and others against them, of the way they were robbed and manhandled by these armed and uncontrolled bands. They asked the Government for its aid, feeling that if it were unable to provide it, then they should at least be allowed to arm themselves in self-defense. The Government promised to aid the Armenians, but that promise was never made good. Moreover it would not allow the Armenians to arm in self-defense, even though the Kurds and other non-Christians were allowed to bear arms. Such an absolutely unfair and

discriminatory policy brought about a very precarious and dangerous situation for the Armenians, and they were in a very serious dilemma. This was the situation from the end of the 19th century until the outbreak of the First World War.

In the meantime the Turks developed their own plan for taking care of the Armenians' problems as became evident soon after the outbreak of the war. Taking Germany's side in that war, the Turks felt they were in a position to carry out their evil design of eliminating the Armenian element in Turkey, for none of the foreign governments sympathetic to the Armenians would be able to intervene on their behalf. Unfortunately, in this the Turks were correct; there was no one to restrain their deadly hands, and no power could stop them in their murderous task.

Their plans were carried out so effectively and efficiently that of the 2 million Armenians then living in the Ottoman Empire, more than 1 million died by the end of 1915. Half of these were massacred outright, while the rest were starved to death, or lost their lives under unbearable hardships during their forced deportation. In this national genocide Armenians by the hundreds of thousands were sold into slavery, while some managed to escape into Russia and Persia.

Such was the fate of the most industrious, enterprising, and progressive element in the Ottoman Empire. In one foul campaign they were eliminated from the land where they and their ancestors had lived for thousands of years. It was the most tragic blow struck against this helpless and peaceful national group in their long and turbulent history. In the past these people had experienced hardships, had put up with oppressive alien rulers, and some had even been massacred. But at no time in their national history were they subjected to wholesale and indiscriminate massacres until in 1915. This was done to them by their heartless overlords, the Turks.

This year marks the 50th anniversary of that national tragedy, that first case of genocide in modern history, perpetrated by the Turks in 1915. Armenians throughout the world are observing this sad anniversary with due solemnity, and their friends join them in paying tribute to the victims of that unspeakable crime against humanity.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I am especially pleased that so many Members of the House have seen fit to participate this afternoon in this special order. Earlier in the week and during sessions last week, other Members have spoken on the subject of this year's commemoration of the Turkish genocide against the Armenian people.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, with mixed emotion we mark the 50th anniversary of the Turkish genocide of the Armenian people.

In taking special notice of the shocking events in 1915, we observe this anniversary with sorrow in recalling the massacres of Armenians and with pride in saluting those brave patriots who survived the attacks to fight on the side of freedom during World War I.

The stouthearted Armenian people who escaped the terror, murder, and carnage set an example for the free world by their devotion to the cause of freedom and by their tremendous personal sacrifices.

I join my colleagues in pausing to extend our deep sympathy to thousands of Americans whose Armenian forefathers fought for freedom with our war allies and who have given so much of themselves to make this a better country, and a strong one.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, the Armenian people were the helpless victims of the First World War. They lost all their worldly possessions, and more than 1 million of them died through wholesale massacres and famine. All this terrible holocaust took place in Turkey in 1915. At the beginning of that year there were about 2 million living in the Ottoman Empire. There they had lived for many centuries, long before the coming of the Ottoman Turks into Asia Minor. In their ancient homeland in eastern Asia Minor, they had somehow fended for themselves and had preserved their distinct ethnic status. They were successful in doing this even under the Ottoman Turks for several centuries, but toward the end of the last century, when all other non-Turkish subjects of the Turks had secured their freedom, it was natural for the Armenians to work for the improvement of their unhappy lot.

With that in mind, they asked the Turkish authorities for help, for reforms in areas where they formed a considerable portion of the population. In particular they asked for protection against the unbridled brigandage and violent acts of the Kurds. The Government promised to do something, but nothing was done. Then in desperation Armenian leaders appealed to European governments for aid.

These governments had already shown serious concern over the fate of the Armenian people in Turkey, and they advised the Turkish Government to introduce administrative reforms to improve their lot. The Turks agreed to introduce certain reforms, but they felt that European interference in their internal affairs was uncalled for, and they blamed the Armenians for this. The Turkish authorities were furious, and they seem to have decided to teach the Armenians a lesson.

Early in the First World War, this lesson took the form of the wholesale massacre of Armenians in all parts of the Ottoman Empire. In the execution of this inhuman measure the Turks were efficient and thorough. Before the end of 1915 nearly all of the 2 million Armenians had been uprooted from their homes and about half of them had been massacred and starved to death, while most of the survivors either became refugees in nearby lands, or were serving as slaves in Turkish homes. Such was the tragic fate of the Armenians in Turkey in 1915, and today the 50th anniversary of that national tragedy is being observed in all Armenian communities throughout the world.

Mr. BATES. Mr. Speaker, back in 1939, Adolf Hitler contemptuously asked

the members of the Third Reich: "Who, pray say, remembers the Armenian massacres today?" He recognized that the world had not acted to redress the heinous genocide which the Government of the Turkish Empire launched against the Armenians on April 24, 1915. But today there is a determination among freedom-loving people everywhere that neither the mass murders of Hitler's Germany nor the atrocious massacres of the Armenians will ever be forgotten.

As we pause to commemorate the 50th anniversary of the World War I Turkish outrage, a World War II concentration camp in Germany is being unveiled as a permanent museum and reminder of the acts of other madmen. Never again let it be said that the world does not remember.

However, as new generations come along, there always seem to be those who believe that "it can't happen to us." We have in America and other Western nations today those who would have our country turn its back on aggression and oppression by modern-day practitioners of fear and intimidation—yes, and genocide. May God help all doubters to understand and rally against any repetition of such lessons in history as on those ignominious pages of 1915–18.

More than 1 million citizens of the Armenian nation were slaughtered and another million displaced at the hands of the Turkish brigands. Yet, those who survived went on to become what President Wilson affectionately called "our little ally" of the First World War. Their contribution to the American victory was great, inspired by the martyrdom of those who lost their lives in the cause of freedom.

It is incredible that such an all-out attempt to annihilate a whole race of people should have been started in Turkey in 1915, particularly in view of nearly a century of bloody massacre after bloody massacre, in which hundreds of thousands of Armenians, Greeks, Syrians, Maronites, and Bulgarians were slain by the Turks. But the bloodiest of all the Turkish massacres did take place a scant half century ago.

Hopefully, the rapidity of modern communication and the prospect of prompt retaliation from peace-loving countries will deter future despots from repeating such acts of wholesale barbarism. But we cannot leave it to history books alone to express our contempt for genocide or anything closely resembling it. We must continually remind the world as we are doing today—so that the sacrifice of the Armenians, and others like them, shall not have been entirely in vain.

Mr. Speaker, we in the United States are proud of the people of many races and creeds who have made our Nation great. Those of Armenian descent have contributed notably to the preservation and proliferation of the American way of life. I salute them particularly at this time as we honor the memory of their forebears in their former strife-stricken homeland.

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Speaker, I think that our colleague, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DERWINSKI], is performing a valuable service in reminding the people

of the United States of the brave history of the Armenian people.

I want to express my own personal admiration for the gallantry which Armenians have displayed in their fight for freedom.

In the congressional district which I represent, many Americans of Armenian descent have proven that they can render the same great service to this Nation as their ancestors have rendered in the past in their homeland.

They are warm, friendly, hard-working people who are respected and admired in their community.

I am proud and pleased to hail them and wish them well.

Mr. DANIELS. Mr. Speaker, today we are observing the 50th anniversary of one of the greatest crimes against humanity in the history of the world, the murder or deportation of almost 2 million Armenians by the Turks.

What happened 50 years ago was part of a plan to obliterate the Armenian people from the face of the earth. Clearly, the Turks were guilty of the most heinous of crimes, genocide, the attempted murder of a whole people.

It is easy to blame only the Turks for this terrible crime. But in a larger sense all the people of the world can share in the guilt for the awful happenings which occurred in this ancient land, for the world treated this monstrous crime with an attitude of almost complete disinterest.

In the Bible we read of the certain man who rode down from Jerusalem to Jericho and fell among robbers and after being robbed and beaten, lay in a ditch while two priests passed him by despite his obvious need for aid. Fifty years ago, the so-called civilized world behaved toward the Armenian people as those two priests did toward the man who had been robbed and beaten.

In that same Biblical story, a certain man out of Samaria, that most despised of lands, came to the aid of the victim after the two lordly religious leaders had ignored his plight.

So many years have passed since those terrible days that there is very little that we can do to right the wrongs that were committed, other than to utter a silent prayer that one day the Armenian people shall come into their rightful inheritance. We can, however, resolve to always emulate the way of the good Samaritan.

There are very few Armenian families who were not personally touched by the great massacre. It has left a scar that time will never wipe out. To the descendants and relatives of the victims we who did so little in their time of need can only say mea culpa.

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, 50 years ago this year one of the most cold-blooded and savage attempts to eradicate a people from the face of the earth took place: the massacre of hundreds of thousands of helpless Armenians by the troops of the Ottoman Turkish Empire. Seeking only their freedom from the tyranny of the Sultan, the Armenians were subjected to a campaign so ruthless in its effects that, despite the intervening barbarities of Hitler Ger-

many, the mind boggles at its severity and magnitude.

The Armenians established themselves in the Transcaucasus hundreds of years before the birth of Christ, and became an important part of the mosaic of peoples and cultures which made up the past as well as the present Middle East. It is only in recent years, as the spade of the archeologist digs deeper into the history of man, that we are beginning to learn of the contributions made by the Armenians. Yet, for centuries they were used by this power or that power in order to fulfill selfish ends. And, when their very existence as a people was threatened, no one offered assistance.

We should remember this event and this people. We should remember the massacres as a symbol of the futility of carnage as a solution to problems of race or creed, and we should remember this people as a symbol of the will of all peoples to live according to their own traditions, in freedom.

Mr. GRABOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, the Armenian tragedy of 1915 was the saddest heritage of the First World War for the Armenian people. Even in their long and turbulent history, full of trials and tribulations and massacres, the tragedy of 1915 was quite unprecedented in its immensity and extent. It is difficult if not impossible to comprehend the nature of this tragedy, which, in less than 1 year, uprooted nearly all of the 2 million Armenians in Turkey. More than 1 million Armenians died while many hundreds of thousands were condemned to involuntary servitude in Turkish households and others were sold to Arabs and Kurds as slaves. As if by some unaccountable stroke of fate, the Armenians in Turkey were singled out and carried off from an area three times the size of the New England States, with most of them doomed to certain death. The monstrous machinery which the rulers of Turkey had devised for bringing on this wholesale deportation and massacre worked so effectively and ceaselessly, that even before the end of that year they were congratulating themselves for ridding Turkey of its Armenian population.

There are so many causes for this tragedy, so many alleged and actual reasons for Turkish cruelty toward the Armenians that it is not easy even now to list and catalog them in full. While I will try to enumerate and elaborate on some of these causes, it would be well to begin with some background information on Armenia and the Armenian people.

Armenia is the name of the country in the high, mountainous plateau in the eastern and northeastern part of Asia Minor, with an area of about 100,000 square miles. This area has been the homeland of the Armenian people for at least 2,500 years, and perhaps for a much longer period. Today more than four-fifths of this area form part of Turkey. Only a small portion in the northeasternmost part, about 11,000 square miles, constitutes the Soviet Socialist Republic of Armenia—an integral part of the Soviet Union. The most characteristic feature of the land is its high elevation, most of it ranging well over 3,000 feet above sea level, and some

reaching up to and above 6,000 feet. Armenia is a rugged and rough country, with a rather temperate climate, quite cold in winter and severely hot in dry summers. Only part of the country is productive agricultural land, but its fertile valleys and plains have produced abundant food under normal peaceful conditions for its hardy inhabitants. From most ancient days the country has been known as being rich in mineral and metallic natural resources, though to this day it has not been properly and adequately explored or surveyed.

The Armenian people have given their name to this land and have lived there. During the 9th-6th centuries before our era, part of the country was known by another name, Urartu. Centuries earlier the country was inhabited—in part, at least—by a people called Hurrians, who ruled over it during the 15th-13th centuries before our era. The coming of the Armenian people into the area and their origin is not quite clear. The generally accepted view has been that they came from Thrace sometime during the Greek migration to Asia Minor in the 11th century B.C., and then gradually moved to the Armenian tableland. More recently the prevalent view is that not all of the ancestors came from Thrace, but that many were of native stock, and the intermixture of these two groups gave rise to the Armenian people. Be that as it may, the Armenians lived in this land known by their name for more than 2,500 years, until their almost total elimination from that part of Armenian territory which is part of today's Turkey.

The long and turbulent history of the Armenian people has been sad and tragic. Throughout their history the Armenians have enjoyed peace and tranquillity in their homeland for only brief periods. Their homeland has been the bridge as well as the battleground of invading and conquering hordes from the east. Because of their geographic location, the Armenians have suffered in the course of wars between Rome and Persia, between the Greeks and the Arabs, between the Greeks and the Turks, and finally between the Persians and the Turks. Innumerable times their homeland has been partitioned between Rome and Persia, and between the Turks and Persians.

From the 7th to the 10th century Armenia was under the suzerainty of the Arabs. But by the mid-11th century Seljuk Turks overran the country. For several centuries the Armenian people were subjected to the oppressive rule of these Seljuk overlords. Then early in the 16th century nearly all Armenia was conquered by the Ottoman Turks, and from that time on, for four centuries, most of the Armenians lived under Ottoman sultans.

During their subjection to Ottoman Turks the Armenians struggled to maintain their national consciousness by keeping alive their national church and their language. Whenever they were oppressed by the Turks and whenever they felt the weight of the Ottoman yoke unbearable, they inevitably dreamed of the day when they could be free in their homeland, free from alien rulers. These

aspirations were supported by their friends and sympathizers in the West. Late in the 19th century many Armenians felt that with the aid of European governments, they could obtain a measure of the autonomy to which they felt they were entitled. At the same time the Turkish Government, never admitting the validity of Armenian claims to equality and justice under the Turks, persecuted them for alleged conspiracy. Thus a very tense situation had developed by the turn of the century. The more the Armenian people pressed for some equality, the more the Turks resisted these Armenian claims. Numerous times the Turks resorted to mass murders and massacres, thereby hoping to discourage the Armenians from putting forth any claim for justice and equality. But such inhuman measures did not discourage the Armenians.

Massacres convinced the Armenian people that unless they could find a way of improving their unbearable lot, they were doomed to extinction as a distinct national community. And since they themselves could not bring about a change for the better, and since the Turkish Government was unwilling to do anything for them, they felt that the only way was to enlist the aid and assistance of European governments. As they made this move in desperation, they were overly optimistic. They felt that since these European governments had helped other Christian subjects of the Turks to attain autonomy and independence, these same governments would also aid them in their struggle. Of course we know today that this was a grave miscalculation on their part. For a number of reasons, these governments, though sympathetic with the Armenian cause, could not and would not aid the Armenians. And during World War I, when none of them could come to their aid, they were at the mercy of angry Turks.

During the decades preceding that war, when Armenian leaders were quite active in enlisting European sympathy for their cause, the Turks became suspicious of these moves. They felt that if European governments became too involved in Armenian affairs, they would use that as an excuse to interfere in Turkey's internal affairs. And the more these European governments showed some concern over the lot of the Armenian people, the more suspicious became the Turks. It seems that then the Turkish Government had its own plan for getting rid of its Armenian population at the first opportune moment, when none of the European friends of the Armenian people could come to their aid.

The War of 1914-18 offered them the opportunity. At the time, Britain, France, and Russia were staunch supporters of the Armenian cause; but, as all these governments were involved in the war against the Turks, they could not restrain the Turks in their inhuman excesses. In less than a year these callous and clumsy, but shrewd and wily Turks, succeeded in carrying out their design of ridding Turkey of its Armenian population through deportation, massacres, and slow death by famine and misery.

Today, 50 years after that tragic event, there are hardly any Armenians left in the historic Armenia that is part of the Turkish Republic, and only about 75,000 Armenians in certain Turkish cities remain of the once wealthy and prosperous Armenian community of about 2 million souls. Some fortunate ones who had survived this tragedy have since joined hands with their compatriots in the Russian-held portion of Armenia and have constituted their own Soviet Socialist Republic. On the 50th anniversary observance of this wanton genocide we do homage to the memory of its victims and wish peace and tranquillity to those living in a corner of their historic Armenia.

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, World War I caused misery and misfortune to many peoples, some being innocent victims of that war, but none suffered such irreparable losses as did the Armenians in Turkey.

Early in the war the Turkish Government publicized spurious charges that certain Armenian elements were fomenting uprisings and revolutions in the country, and on the basis of such unproved charges the authorities proceeded to eliminate all of the 2 million Armenians in the Ottoman Empire. Their plan was to get rid of the Armenians through deportation, famine, and wholesale massacres.

This hideous plan, carefully concealed until Turkey's entry into the war, was carried out in the course of 1915. Nearly all Armenians were uprooted from their homes, and many hundreds of thousands were massacred during the first few days of this forced deportation, while other hundreds of thousands were starved to death. Some saved their lives by escaping to nearby lands, and others were sold to Arabs, Kurds, and Turks as slaves.

In less than a year, this large, prosperous and industrious Armenian community in Turkey was no more. It was wiped out in the first case of genocide in modern history.

It is fitting for us today to honor the memory of the Armenian people who sought only to live peacefully in their ancient homeland. And in remembering the sufferings of the Armenian people we serve the cause of humanity by reaffirming this Nation's dedication to the ideals of liberty and justice for every individual.

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DERWINSKI] for offering me the opportunity to join with him and many of our colleagues in this House in the commemoration of the 50th anniversary of the Turkish genocide of the Armenian people.

America properly recognizes this occasion because of our belief in humanity and because of the help the Armenian people gave the Allied war effort in World War I.

For decades and even for centuries the Armenian people in Turkey were known as the most enterprising and industrious racial element in the country. But soon after the First World War this people became known as the massacred Armenians and the starved Armenians. At the time no adjectives could describe

these unfortunate souls more correctly, for in the year 1915 about half of Turkey's 2 million Armenians were massacred, and the survivors of this ghastly holocaust were starving. There is no denying of these horrors and terrors, this man-made hell on earth to which the blameless and defenseless Armenians were relegated.

No other event in the whole First World War was so shocking as this inhumanity of Ottoman authorities toward their Armenian subjects. They meant to annihilate through wholesale massacres, famine, and unthinkable tortures, all Armenians in Turkey, irrespective of age and sex. In this fiendish task they almost succeeded. Before the end of 1915 nearly all Armenians were uprooted from their homes, and not one Armenian was to be found, except in slavery, in the land which was their ancient homeland for thousands of years.

That event of 50 years ago, Mr. Speaker, is the national tragedy of the Armenian people. They are observing its sad anniversary everywhere, and I am glad to join them in paying tribute to the memory of the 1 million Armenians who were victims of Turkey's act of genocide in 1915.

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Speaker, 50 years ago one of the most monstrous crimes ever perpetuated against a nearly defenseless people took place—the Armenian massacres. Although they have since been surpassed in fury by the actions of the Nazi Germans against the Jews shortly over two decades ago, this is no reason why they should be forgotten.

In the years before World War I, the Ottoman Empire, the last of the great multinational empires of the East, exercised dominion over literally scores of different peoples, races and religions. Decrepit and incompetent, it was called "the sick man of Europe." During its last years, many of the peoples within its borders sought to regain their freedom, and agitated for reforms. Among these were the Armenians, a people with a history and culture extending back into the millennia before Christ.

The advent of World War I and the preoccupations of the other powers unfortunately gave the Empire its opportunity to extract revenge. Beginning in the spring of 1915, it undertook a barbarous campaign designed to eliminate once and for all the imagined threat which the Armenians presented. Hundreds of thousands of innocents were slaughtered, and nearly all the remainder driven into exile.

It is worth recalling these events today as a reminder of the barbarity of man at his worst. At the same time, however, it is a more meaningful reminder that it is impossible to eradicate brave men anywhere. I therefore pay tribute to the Armenian people and their past tribulations, and wish them nothing but the best in the future.

Mr. HELSTOSKI. Mr. Speaker, the legacy of the First World War still weighs heavily upon all peoples involved in that international conflict, for all of them suffered by it. In some cases, however, certain minority groups suffered more during the war, and lost infinitely more

than many actual participants in the war. The fate of the Armenian people in Turkey is a sad and tragic instance. There these unhappy people suffered the loss of all their worldly possessions, and their losses in human lives totaled more than 1 million people. And even more tragic is the fact that this loss was caused by carefully planned and effectively executed wholesale massacres by the Turkish Government.

For centuries the Armenian people had led a precarious existence as subjects of Ottoman sultans. They suffered under severe discriminations and disabilities. When they were attacked and man-handled by the Kurds, and when their homes were ravaged by unruly tribes, the Government failed to afford them protection; nor did it allow the Armenians to bear and possess arms in self-defense. Despite the fact that economically they were more prosperous than the indolent Turks and carefree Kurds, the Armenians were considered as second-class citizens by the Government and treated accordingly.

Toward the end of the 19th century, as other Christian subjects of Turkey regained their freedom with the aid of European governments, Armenians hoped that these governments would also help them to improve their unbearable lot. They did not expect just and fair treatment to be offered by the Turkish Government, but they felt that certain European governments could induce the Turks to be just toward them. Actually these governments did influence the Turkish Government to issue promises and make pledges with a view to introducing reforms in the Armenian provinces. All this seemed promising, and the Armenians were encouraged to look forward to the betterment of their unenviable lot. In reality, however, it turned out that the Turks resented deeply this European interference in their purely internal affairs. They thought that the Armenian leaders were responsible for Europe's intervention, and therefore they decided to teach the Armenians a lesson. They resolved to eliminate the Armenian element in the country, and thus once and for all put an end to the Armenian problem. World War I presented the Turks with the best possible opportunity to carry out their hideous designs with impunity.

At the beginning of the war there were about 2 million Armenians in Turkey. Early in 1915 nearly all of them were uprooted from their homes on the baseless pretext that they were plotting against the Government, and deported to distant Mesopotamian and Syrian Deserts. There, some were massacred with a brutality and cruelty rare in the annals of human history, while others were condemned to slow death by starvation. In this manmade holocaust, the first case of planned genocide in modern history, more than 1 million Armenians lost their lives in the course of a single year. Several hundred thousand Armenians were lucky enough to escape to neighboring countries, while a larger number of women and children were enslaved in Turkish, Kurdish, and Arab homes. In short, in 1 year during the First World War, the entire Armenian

community in Turkey, consisting of the sinews and brains of Turkey's economic, industrial, and commercial life, was wiped out through wholesale massacres, deportation, and enslavement. That was the legacy of World War I to the Armenians who by sheer chance and good luck survived their national tragedy.

It is unfortunate and paradoxical that these people, who were the first to adopt the Christian faith as their state religion in the third century and who stoutly defended Christianity against paganism and Mohammedanism for more than 1,500 years, often at a terrific cost in human lives, could not obtain effective aid from their European friends. This nation of a few millions, though seldom allowed to enjoy tranquillity in their historic homeland, had rendered signal services to Europe's crusades in the Holy Land. And finally, this unhappy and unfortunate people, many of whom had enrolled abroad in the fighting forces of the Allied and associated Powers during World War I and fought gallantly in defense of democracy and freedom, were left to their unhappy fate at the end of the war.

On the 50th anniversary of this national tragedy we pay tribute to the Armenian victims of Turkish genocide and wish peace and tranquillity to the surviving Armenian people.

The great sacrifices of the Armenian people and their undying devotion to the cause of freedom will be spread upon the pages of history for all future generations. The Armenian fight for good government and their fight for human rights should not be forgotten. I am happy to be able to participate in paying tribute to these brave people and hope that their suffering for the cause of freedom and justice shall not have been in vain.

Mr. HANLEY. Mr. Speaker, April 24, 1915, a turbulent day forecasting many days of national and individual pain and sorrow, is a scarred, bloody marker in the chronicle of human suffering.

The security of peace and freedom as we in America enjoy it is almost totally unknown in the small nation of Armenia. This country has geographically and historically been the bridge and battleground of foreign forces. The strife erupting between Rome and Persia, between Byzantium and the Arabs, the Arabs and the Turks, exploded on Armenian soil slashing the ugly knives of hate and greed through Armenia's soul. Many alien masters have tried to impose their language and religion on these captives of history but the strong determination of the Armenians resisted and remained loyal to their consciences and culture.

For 400 years the Turkish Empire ruled over the Armenians. During this period the Armenians forecasted, faithfully fought, and waited for the day they could have freedom in their own homeland. Finally in the aging 19th century, the Armenians felt their endless plight could be realized with the aid of European governments. Simultaneously the Turkish Government, waiting for an opportunity to take severe action against their captives, persecuted the Armenians for al-

leged conspiracy and for fomenting disturbances.

This persecution formulated one of the most vile, inhuman chapters of ancient and modern books. On April 24, 1915, the Turks commenced vast massacres and at the end of that year, 1 million Armenians had been murdered at the hands of these dictators. The deadly hand of vengeance passed over every Armenian community smearing the land with blood, filling the Armenians with sorrow and desperation—slaughters carried out by a prearranged plan through monstrous machinery. A decree by the Turks had declared that all Armenians be disarmed. Armenian men had been drafted into an army. A public crier would announce to a town that all men were to report to duty—a rendezvous with death on a desolate road. Wives of these victims were killed or sold into slavery as were their children.

On April 24 we paid a solemn tribute to the thousands of Armenians who fifty years ago lost their lives for the sake of individual and national freedom—for the right of life with all its responsibilities and freedoms.

Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to join with my distinguished colleague from Illinois [Mr. DERWINSKI] today in a tribute to the terrible sacrifice of a brave people.

The road to eventual universal freedom is bathed in the blood of patriots, to paraphrase Thomas Jefferson. In this long and weary journey toward liberty for mankind, the grandeur of the spirit of the Armenian people rises like a beacon in the dark night of the soul of the oppressed.

If we, as Americans in a free society, enjoy the privileges of liberty today, we owe a debt of gratitude to the Armenian people. They fought by our side in World War I; they resisted aggression on their own soil; they were overwhelmed by the numbers of those who opposed them, but the spirit they gave to the battle endures.

We pause, today, to remind ourselves of the legacy we have been given. We look back upon it. We profit from it.

And the spirit of all men is enlarged and ennobled because of it.

Mr. STALBAUM. Mr. Speaker, the Armenian people who were martyred 50 years ago through the Turkish genocide are almost forgotten in the moments of history so I take this opportunity to recall the courage of these courageous victims.

The Armenian nation was a great part of the Allied forces which gained victory against greed and tyranny in World War I and its contribution was overwhelming for so small a country.

In my hometown of Racine, Wis., I treasure my genuine friendships with surviving and following generations of these Armenian martyrs. They are wonderful Americans who share in the responsibilities of community life and contribute greatly to intellectual wealth of our Nation. I humbly pay respect to the memory of their martyred forebears.

My esteemed colleague from Wisconsin, Congressman CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI, eloquently traced this story of human sacrifice and devotion to the cause of

freedom on April 25 when he addressed the Armenian community at Memorial Hall in Racine to commemorate the 50th anniversary of this horrible mass murder of innocent human beings.

The full text of Congressman ZABLOCKI's commemorative address, "Genocide and the Future of Man," follows:

GENOCIDE AND THE FUTURE OF MAN

(Speech of Hon. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI, of Wisconsin, at Armenian martyrs 50th observance, Sunday, Apr. 25, 1965)

At the outset I want to express my deep appreciation at having been asked to speak at this 50th observance of the Armenian martyrs. I am indebted to your committee and to Mr. Jeknavorian for having asked me to participate in today's program.

My friends, we truly live in a marvelous age.

Only 7 years ago the Soviet Union launched its first sputnik into space. Today men are sent into space and tomorrow men will land on the moon, to explore that planet as once Columbus explored the Western Hemisphere.

There are wonders, too, of modern medicine. Diseases which had been the scourge of men for centuries have been virtually wiped out in the space of a few years.

Smallpox, typhus, bubonic plague, polio, typhoid, cholera—all these diseases have yielded before the mind and technology of modern man.

There also have been tremendous advances in feeding people, in housing them, in providing clothing for their bodies.

Through modern fertilizers and irrigation techniques the deserts have been made to bloom and former wastelands have produced abundance beyond man's wildest hopes.

New building materials have revolutionized man's search for proper housing for himself and his family.

New synthetic fibers have brought more versatile and less expensive clothing.

We need only look around us to see the marvels which have been brought to us by modern science and technology.

Yet for all these signs of progress, for all these indications that man is advancing, we still have not learned to cope with the basic problem of man's inhumanity to man.

As knowledge has grown more vast, wars have grown more terrible. With new methods of preserving and improving life have come novel ways of killing and destroying.

Today at least five nations have developed bombs capable of destroying whole cities—millions of people—in a single blast. We have seen the destruction which can be wrought by an atomic bomb—at Hiroshima and Nagasaki. We have seen the awesome power of the H-bomb at Bikini Atoll.

Modern science also has produced other modern weapons of awesome destruction. I am thinking of napalm, a jellied petroleum-base explosive that envelopes its victims in flames and cremates them alive.

There is nerve gas—developed by the Germans during World War II—which is invisible, odorless, and tasteless. Yet this gas can kill a man as quickly as a bullet to the brain.

It was scientific advances which put into the hands of the Nazis power to carry out extermination of Jews and Slavs in numbers that even today stagger the imagination.

Six million Jews in Europe went to the gas chambers. In addition more millions of Poles, Czechs, and other Slavic peoples were killed by Hitler's madness.

Without the specially developed gases, this slaughter would have been impossible. Without the specially designed ovens, the mass killings would have been thwarted.

Science—a tool of man's peaceful progress—became in the hands of the Nazis an instrument of that most heinous of crimes: genocide.

Genocide: The use of deliberate measures to exterminate a racial, political, or cultural group. Genocide: A crime against mankind that stands condemned by all organized religions, by history, and, in our own time, by special convention of the United Nations. Genocide: A sin that cries to God for vengeance.

Terrible though it is, genocide is an age-old sin of man. Born of narrow loyalties, nurtured in dark hatred and practiced with unrivaled savagery, genocide—instances of genocide—blacken the pages of world history.

We call to mind the great Greek epic of Homer—the Iliad. It is the story of the war between the Greeks and the Trojans. The conflict ended with the complete destruction of the Trojan people and their culture.

History also tells us of the titanic struggle between Rome and Carthage in the ancient world. When the Roman armies overcame the Carthaginians after years of battle, men, women, and children were put to the sword.

The city of Carthage itself was leveled—not one stone left upon a stone. And when that was finished the Romans salted the earth round about so that no living thing would grow there again for centuries.

It was with similar savage deeds that later Romans attempted to crush Christianity. We all know the stories of men, women, and children fed to lions simply because of their belief in God. We revere those who lost their lives because of their faith and honor them as saints and martyrs.

Today we honor another group of martyrs—Christian Armenians who became victims of mass persecution less than three generations ago.

It was on April 24, 1915, that the Government of Turkey, led by ruthless villains, took the first step in a systematic plan to exterminate the Armenian people.

On that day over 100 Armenian intellectuals were arrested in Constantinople. These victims were transported into the interior of Turkey and coldly murdered.

It was the first step in an attempt to wipe out the Armenian nation, the oppressed ancient inhabitants of Asia Minor and the Caucasus.

The events of those days and nights of horror are, I am sure, known much better to you than ever they could be recounted by me—even if a lifetime of study were devoted to the subject.

One can read of the massacre of the Armenian men, of the women being attacked, raped, and murdered, of children put to the sword or sold into slavery.

It is not an exaggeration that 1 million Armenians died during those terrible days.

One can comprehend all those facts and yet not appreciate their import as you do. Many of you lost parents, brothers, aunts, uncles, cousins, friends in the slaughter. Your lives have been intimately touched by this senseless outrage.

You know full well the horror of genocide.

It is a lesson that the world should learn well. Despite the terrible example of genocide practiced against the Armenians in World War I and the Jews in World War II, we still see attempts by races—peoples—to annihilate others.

Last year, for example, the newspapers were full of the story of the fierce tribal war between the Balubas and the Watulus. The rivers of Africa ran red in the slaughter of the tall Watulus tribesmen by the much smaller, but more numerous Balubas.

Less violent, but no less significant has been the effort by the Soviet Union to stifle its Jewish minority. The Jews are deprived by law from the basic cultural rights accorded to other nationalities.

The present Kremlin rulers are blaming the Jewish population of the U.S.S.R. and making them scapegoats for the regime's unsound economic policies. Jews have been singled out for persecution for so-called "eco-

nomic" crimes, and have been denied the right to practice their religion.

We need only look to Communist Rumania for another example of a people systematically persecuting other people. For years the Hungarian minority living in Transylvania, a province of Rumania, have suffered discrimination, persecution and even death—simply because of their nationality.

Another prime example of genocide can be seen in the treatment of the people of Tibet by the Red Chinese. China has imposed a harsh rule on that once sovereign country and has forced the Tibetan ruler and spiritual chief—the Dalai Lama—to flee for his life.

Although few reports reach the West from those remote regions, it is evident that the Chinese have murdered thousands of persons in an attempt to stamp out any opposition to its absolute rule. The culture and religion of Tibet—among the oldest in the world—have all but been extinguished.

These examples help us to realize that genocide still remains a threat. Nor does it suffice simply to point the accusing finger at the Communist countries or at half-savage African tribesmen.

Here in our own country we have those who would—if given a chance—crush another minority.

There are Americans whose anti-Semitic bias is so strong that they would reinstitute the horrors of Hitler.

There are those in this great land of ours, who, if given a chance, would exterminate those of differing religious beliefs.

Some who harbor these feelings of hatred do not hesitate to state their objectives. There is a small group of fanatics and misfits which calls itself the American Nazi Party.

The leaders of this group have called on many occasions for open warfare against Jews and Negroes. There are other groups—perhaps less extreme than the American Nazi Party—which have similar aims.

It is a credit to the American people that those who support violent racist views are a small minority—most of them on the lunatic fringe.

But at the same time it would be foolish to state flatly that "it can't happen here"—to believe that the genocide practiced against Armenians, against Jews, against Christians, couldn't possibly happen in the United States.

It could happen here if we as Americans fail to hold fast to the ideals upon which this Nation was founded and prospered.

It could happen here if we cease to be on guard against every form of bigotry and prejudice.

It could happen here if we forget that every time the rights of another man are curtailed, we all are that much less free.

When an American citizen is denied the right to vote because he is a Negro, the democratic franchise of us all is less secure.

When a Jew is denied a job because of religion, our own right to work and support our families is abridged.

When a man is treated badly because he has an accent to his speech, or slanted eyes, or distinct facial characteristics or unique customs—then we are all less secure in the enjoyment of our liberties.

It is in this sense, then, that we must struggle to fulfill the promise of America. The Great Society, as described by President Johnson, is a striving, a constant effort to bring the fruits of democracy and justice to all our citizens.

In this effort, you as Americans of Armenian descent can play a special role. You and your ancestors have struggled for centuries for freedom and self-determination. You know the value of liberty and have been willing to pay the cost of preserving it.

Thus, you are in an excellent position to assist other peoples, other minority groups,

as they strive for freedom and equality within our American system.

But your role extends beyond just the shores of the United States. The Armenian heritage contains a lesson for all mankind.

It exposes the folly of narrow nationalistic concerns which breed hatred and violence.

The Armenian experience emphasizes the horror which results when one race, one nation, sets out to destroy another.

It points up the fact that genocide must be universally condemned as abhorrent to humanity and to the author of all life.

In our nuclear age—when a single act of genocide could encompass whole continents—the future of mankind may well depend on how well individual human beings learn the lesson taught by the death of the Armenian Martyrs.

The task, therefore, is an awesome one. Yet the reward is high. For if our efforts—and those of men of good will everywhere—come to fruition, our children or our children's children may see a blessed time on earth, characterized by one outstanding fact:

That man is humane to man.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, the Armenians are one of the oldest peoples in human history, and today they are one of the few surviving nations of the ancient world. Their national history precedes our Christian era by many centuries. In their mountainous homeland in eastern Asia Minor they had constituted their own state and were content with their primitive, self-contained lot. But Armenia being placed across the path of invaders and conquerors, it was invaded and overrun by numerous Asiatic hordes including the Mongols, Tartar, Seljuk Turks, and finally Ottoman Turks, and the Armenian people lived for centuries under the oppressive alien rulers in their homeland.

While thus overwhelmed by these powerful hordes, and held down by brute force for centuries, the Armenians managed to maintain their distinct national entity, their own language, and above all their Christian faith. They did this even under most adverse circumstances, under the Ottoman Turks. Toward the end of the 19th century, however, they were unduly oppressed by both the government of Turkey and also by the unruly and wild Kurds. The Armenian leaders complained to the authorities and when the government failed to do anything for the improvement of conditions in the Armenian provinces of Turkey, then they appealed to European governments for some aid. These governments, which had acted as trustees of oppressed Christian subjects of Turkey, manifested serious concern with the fate of the Armenians, and they induced the Turks to protect the Armenians against the Kurds. The Turks reluctantly promised to do this but considered it European interference in their internal affairs. They felt that European intervention was caused by the presence of Armenians in Turkey. They then thought of eliminating the Armenian element in Turkey, through wholesale massacres if necessary.

Their evil and inhuman intentions were revealed in 1915, when in the course of less than 1 year, nearly all of the 2 million Armenians in Turkey, who had for centuries constituted the most industrious, energetic, peaceful, loyal, and productive element in the Ottoman Em-

pire, were uprooted of their homes and deported to desolate and inhospitable deserts in Mesopotamia and northern Syria. Meanwhile more than 1 million of these were massacred and lost their lives through famine and otherwise. Only a fraction of the total number succeeded to save their lives by escaping to neighboring countries, while hundreds of thousands of others were sold into slavery by Arabs, Kurds, and Turks.

That is the sad and dismal story of the Armenian people in Turkey. It is indeed tragic that these people, who were among the earliest Christians and were the first to adopt Christian faith as their state religion, who had successfully held their own against all their conquerors and preserved their national entity, and through their enterprising activity had become a positive asset of the Ottoman Empire, were decimated and exterminated under circumstances of inhuman cruelty during the First World War. Fortunately for them, and also for us here, the many survivors of that holocaust have migrated to this hospitable Republic, and in a relatively short time, they have already made considerable contribution to our democratic way of life. They have made their marks in industry, in the arts and sciences, in commerce and trade, and in the fine arts and literature. Over all and above all else, they have become faithful, law-abiding, industrious, patriotic, and loyal citizens of their adopted country. On the observance of the 50th anniversary of their national tragedy in Turkey, we join them and pay tribute to the memory of Armenian victims of Turkish massacres in 1915.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the modern history of the Armenian people is characterized by misery and misfortune. Subjected to alien conquerors in their homeland, at times they were not even allowed to enjoy peace and tranquillity in their servitude. Such was their unenviable lot under Ottoman sultans for more than 400 years. There in their historic homeland in eastern Asia Minor, surrounded by wild tribes of different faiths, and held down by inefficient but oppressive government, most of them managed to survive. About 1 million Armenians were thus isolated from the West, and another 1 million were scattered in other parts of Turkey, constituting the most enterprising and industrious element in the old Ottoman Empire. For years they formed the commercial and industrial sinews of Turkey. Unfortunately their usefulness and even their indispensability to the country did not make the Armenians full-fledged citizens of Turkey. They were subjected to discrimination and a series of disabilities which made them barely second-class citizens. Since the Armenians were not members of the dominant race and did not accept the religion of the Turks, they were considered inferior in every respect. Armenians, on their part, had done everything to improve their lot, but all their efforts proved of no avail. They were the constant and ready prey of the plundering and robbing Kurds and corrupt government officials. Neither their property nor their very lives were safe under the

prevailing conditions. And the most discouraging aspect of it all was that the Government did nothing about this abominable situation.

Armenians in desperation had appealed to the governments of Europe for help. They felt that since the Turkish Government would do nothing for them, they hoped and prayed for good words and deeds on the part of certain European governments. Fortunately, for the time being, these governments took up the case of the Armenians and urged the Turkish authorities to make reforms that would help the situation. The Turks promised to do something about it, but they felt that such a promise was extorted from them at the instigation of Armenian leaders. They were intensely angry, and they did not forget this. They seemed determined to teach the Armenians a lesson, and in the course of the First World War that lesson was administered to Armenians indiscriminately, regardless of age and sex, in the form of wholesale massacres, forced deportation, and famine.

This murderous machinery of genocide was put into effect in 1915. First all Armenian community leaders were arrested, imprisoned, and then murdered. Simultaneously Armenians serving in Turkey's armed forces were separated from their fighting units, disarmed and removed under heavy guards to the rear of fighting fronts, and then massacred by their Turkish comrades-in-arms. Then all able-bodied males in Armenian communities, ranging from 12 to 60 years old, were conscripted into "labor battalions," and soon these too were massacred. That left the women, the children, and the aged. These were removed from their homes, some were massacred in a few days, and others were deported to distant Mesopotamian and Syrian deserts, where they suffered slow death through starvation. Others were enslaved as servants and household help in Turkish, Kurdish, and Arab homes. In less than 1 year, in 1915, nearly 2 million Armenians in Turkey disappeared, more than 1 million having lost their lives in this first planned genocide in modern history. Committed decades before the savage onslaught of Hitler against the Jews, this ghastly deed cannot be minimized or condoned by the civilized world. Fifty years after their national tragedy, Armenians everywhere observe this sad anniversary, and I personally join them in paying tribute to the memory of 1 million Armenian victims of this genocide.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, April 24 marked the 50th anniversary of the tragic losses of the Armenian people under the Ottoman Empire. Over 2 million gallant Armenians lost not only their worldly possessions, but more than half died under circumstances of brutality and cruelty.

Arnold Toynbee has written in his definitive work, "Treatment of the Armenians:"

The exact quantitative scale of the crime remains uncertain, but there is no uncertainty as to the responsibility for its preparation. The guilt must therefore fall upon the officials of the Ottoman government, but it will not weigh equally upon all members of the official hierarchy. The behavior

of the gendarmerie, for example, was utterly atrocious; the subordinates were demoralized by the power for evil that was placed in their hands.

There is no earthly power that can approach the bar of public morality with clean hands, unstained by the blood of human life. But if we are still living in a world which has not yet learned to love rather than hate, our remembrance of this tragic occurrence from the past rekindles hope for the future. By paying tribute to the brave Armenian people on this occasion, we dramatize mankind's effort, no matter how feebly, to arouse an awakened conscience to search harder for a better way to live, a more decent way to settle our differences.

Time, education, and spiritual strength remain our best weapons in this eternal struggle against man's inhumanity to man.

Thanks to one of my colleagues, the distinguished Representative from Illinois [Mr. DERWINSKI] made it possible for me to meet His Grace, Archbishop Hrant Kaichadourian, prelate of Armenians of North America. This privilege brought a delightful sense of the oneness of the human family, emphasizing that the suffering of one group is indeed part of the life of all others.

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, many great tragedies live not only in the history books, but in the minds and memories of a great people. The 50th anniversary of the Turkish genocide of the Armenian population still brings a feeling of horror to the American Nation. It is not simple to grasp the dimensions of this tragedy—the fact, for instance, that more was contributed by Armenians to the Allied cause in terms of World War I casualties than by any other single Allied state, large or small, or the fact that it is as if all Armenians living in an area equal in size to the area of the New England States were hunted out, and carried off by some unaccountable affliction.

The Armenians were not protagonists in the war—they bore none of the guilt for its outbreak. But 2 million lived in Turkey, in that empire which had become known by the 20th century as the sick man of Europe, and by the end of 1915, only a handful was left, after a purge that accounted for more than 1 million Armenian lives. The real cause seemed to have been the determination of Turkey to do away with European intervention in behalf of the suffering Armenians.

The devotion of these people to their way of life and their perseverance in the face of oppression and tyranny deserves to be remembered.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, 50 years ago, on April 24, 1915, marked the beginning of the Turkish massacres of the Armenians. On that day the Government of the Turkish Empire arrested over 100 Armenian intellectuals and in a short time executed them. Within the year over 1 million Armenians were killed and another 1 million were driven from their homeland. Because of their Christianity the Armenians were the object of Turkish hatred. By 1915 international politics further compromised the Armenians in the eyes of the Turks. The Turkish Government, then in the

midst of World War I on the side of the Germans, found itself fighting a losing war against the French and the English. The longstanding religious hatred, plus the common Christianity of the Armenians and the Western European allies made the Armenians a natural scapegoat for the proud Turks. Geographically isolated, the Armenians were an easy prey.

In 1915, the church was the principal institution of the Armenian people. Scarcely 10 percent of the Armenian clergymen survived the atrocities. Only one prelate was spared, the others were brutally murdered. Armenian Catholic priests and nuns joined their Armenian Apostolic brethren in death. A frightful toll was exacted from the Armenian Protestant community. According to careful studies, the Turks seized 2,050 Armenian churches and 203 Armenian monasteries during the genocide. Many churches were made into armories or torn down ritualistically.

Mr. Speaker, the spiritual leaders of the Armenian church have designated April as a month of mourning for the massacred Armenians. Pope Paul sung a solemn pontifical mass during the recent session of the Ecumenical Council in Rome for the Armenian martyrs. The Honorable John A. Volpe, Governor of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, has issued a proclamation designating April 24 through May 31, 1965, as a period of mourning for these martyrs. On Saturday last, April 24, the 50th anniversary of the beginning of the Armenian massacres, special commemorative services were conducted throughout the United States for the million Armenians lost in 1915. I had the privilege of participating in one of these observances sponsored by St. Gregory Armenian Apostolic Church of Indian Orchard, Mass., held at the Sheraton Motor Inn in Springfield. I am sure that this was one of the most moving and impressive events held throughout the country to mark the 50th anniversary of the Armenian massacres. It was certainly one of the finest and most impressive commemorative events that I have ever attended. The address delivered by the Most Reverend Christopher J. Weldon, D.D., bishop of the Roman Catholic Diocese of Springfield, was particularly appropriate. The address in the Armenian language by the Very Reverend Khachadour Guiragossian, pastor of the St. Gregory Armenian Apostolic Church, was moving and impressive.

Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I include at this point in the RECORD a newspaper story from the Springfield Sunday Republican of April 25, containing excerpts of Bishop Weldon's fine speech, a copy of the excerpts of the Armenian language speech of Very Rev. Guiragossian, a copy of my address of tribute on this very significant occasion, and a copy of the program for the St. Gregory Armenian Apostolic Church commemorative dinner:

[From the Springfield (Mass.) Sunday Republican, Apr. 25, 1965]

MASSACRE ANNIVERSARY OBSERVED BY ARMENIANS

Observance of the 50th anniversary of the 1915 massacre of some 1,500,000 Armenians

by the Turkish Government was highlighted by an address delivered by Most Rev. Christopher J. Weldon, bishop of the Roman Catholic Diocese of Springfield, at a commemorative dinner program Saturday night at the Sheraton Motor Inn.

TWO HUNDRED ATTEND

More than 200 Greater Springfield residents of Armenian descent remembered that tragic day of April 24, 1915, and heard Bishop Weldon paraphrase that portion of Abraham Lincoln's Gettysburg Address which states, "It's for us the living to dedicate ourselves for those who suffered and died, in order that they may not have died in vain."

Bishop Weldon, signifying Roman Catholic participation in the Armenians' anniversary observance of the slaughter, praised the Armenians here in America and abroad for remembering and keeping alive memories of that day 50 years ago. "Forgetfulness," he said, "breeds repetition."

He said that the Christian idea of brotherhood and love means we may even try to understand why the massacre happened and labor to prevent any repetition in the future.

TRUE TEST

The Springfield clergyman, drawing an analogy to the fact that a 50th anniversary traditionally means gold, said "The true test of gold is that it survives fire." "Armenians," he said, "have been tested by fire, and have survived."

"The fires of hatred ranging with all the atrocities done to the Armenian people," he continued, "have not destroyed the gold of the Armenian spirit."

The Very Rev. Khachadour Guiragossian, pastor of St. Gregory's Armenian Apostolic Church, speaking in Armenian, told of the history and background which led to the Turkish massacre of the Armenians, and said, "Fifty years have passed since that day and the Armenian people still live."

A WITNESS

He said he witnessed in Syria "thousands of starved women and children—unrecognizable, skeletonlike, and nearly naked. Of these Armenians," he continued, "many died before my eyes."

Father Guiragossian said it was the Armenian's faith in Christ that has given them the strength to endure, and concluded, "In this, the 50th year since the massacre, this must be our lesson—our martyrs died to teach us to live."

High masses commemorating April 24, 1915, will observe and remember that day in Armenian churches, locally, nationally, and abroad.

OTHER SPEAKERS

Tributes to the fallen Armenian martyrs were given in short addresses by Mayor Charles V. Ryan, Congressman EDWARD P. BOLAND, and Carnig Piligian, chairman of the board of trustees of the St. Gregory Armenian Apostolic Church, sponsors of the evening's program.

Ryan spoke of the enormity of the 1915 tragedy, and reminded the guests that they have a responsibility in the revitalization and perpetuation of the Armenian people.

A SURVIVOR

Present at the commemorative dinner was Onnik Melikian, who has lived in Springfield since 1926 and who was one of the survivors of the massacre.

He told the Republican he was studying at the St. Nishan Mission, a monetary school in Central Armenia, at the time of the Turkish slaughter. In 1914, he recalled, Armenia's Turkish overlords began registering all Armenians in the Turkish Empire. He received word while at school of the impending tragedy, and left the mission to start resistance groups in the surrounding hills.

There were about 200 groups all together he said, engaging in guerrilla warfare, with between 20 and 25 persons per group.

One day in March 1915, Melikian said, before the sun came up, Turkish troops were dispatched to surround every home in the Turkish Empire in which Armenians lived. The soldiers took all Armenian males between the ages of 13 and 45, put them in jail, and questioned them for 30 days.

STABBED TO DEATH

On April 24, he recalled, the soldiers removed their prisoners at night by twos at bayonet point, and tied them all together in groups of eight. The Armenians, he said, were thrown into pits 100 at a time, and then stabbed to death.

After the males were disposed of the women, the children, and the older men were forced into the Syrian desert and left with no means of support.

Melikian said his closest call came when his hand was besieged for 18 days by Turkish troops at the site of an old Roman fort in Central Armenia. He lost more than half his group of 25 men, and he and the survivors escaped to the hills under the cover of darkness.

Official records show that more than 1,500,000 of his countrymen died at the hands of the Turks, but Melikian estimates the true figure, which he says only the Turkish Government knows, may run as high as 3 million.

Included in the 50th anniversary program Saturday night was a recitation by Mrs. Ardashus A. Aykanian and Mrs. Nishan H. Vartanian of an Armenian poem called The Pilgrimage by Avedis Aharonian, and the singing of two selections appropriate to the day by the Choir of St. Gregory's Armenian Apostolic Church.

Members of the Armenian Martyrs' Day Committee were: Arthur A. Aykanian, chairman; Aroxy Aykanian, Leon Charkoudian, Mrs. Popken J. Hachigian, Alice Margosian, Harry Setian, and Leo Vartanian.

EXCERPTS FROM THE ARMENIAN ADDRESS BY THE VERY REVEREND KHACHADOUR GUIRAGOSSIAN, PASTOR OF ST. GREGORY ARMENIAN APOSTOLIC CHURCH, DELIVERED AT THE COMMEMORATIVE DINNER ON THE 50TH OBSERVANCE OF ARMENIAN MARTYRS' DAY, SATURDAY, APRIL 24, AT THE SHERATON MOTOR INN

Today, April 24, for the Armenian people is a day dedicated to the memory of the 1 million martyrs. In Armenian the word "April" means "to live," but it was that month that the Turks chose to end the life of all Armenians. Fifty years have passed since that day and the Armenian people still live.

The Turkish Government was looking for the opportune moment to exterminate the Armenian people. This time came when the Allies were preoccupied with World War I. The Turkish Government took advantage of the isolated Armenians and at midnight April 24 arrested 100 intellectuals in the capital of Istanbul, deported them inland, then executed them. During the ensuing holy week began the deportation of Armenians from every village, from every town—black clouds hung over Armenians who were driven from their homes of 3,000 years to the barren desert land.

I witnessed with my own eyes in Syria, thousands of starved women and children—unrecognizable, skeletonlike, nearly naked of these Armenians, noble Christians, many died before my eyes.

Between 1915 and 1918 Armenians took refuge in Syria. The Turks wanted to kill us all but they did not reach their objective. Evil never succeeds. For the Armenians that began to gather in Syria, aid came from America through the Near East relief. Orphanages and hospitals were set up. Armenians are eternally indebted to Americans for this aid.

Today 50 years have passed since those dark days and the Armenian population throughout the world has increased to at least that of 1915. Armenians have estab-

lished themselves as good citizens in countries throughout the world.

In 1915 Turks made Armenia a burial ground. Armenians bore a cross on their shoulders; their faith in Christ gave them the strength to endure.

In this, the 50th year since the massacre, this must be our lesson—our martyrs died to teach us to live. Armenians all over the world are commemorating this day. We must have faith in Christ; faith in our future. Faith is a must to succeed and faith is tied to hope and love. Love of God, love of friends, neighbors—no matter of race, nationality. Love works miracles.

SPEECH BY CONGRESSMAN EDWARD P. BOLAND

The long and turbulent history of the Armenian people has been sad and tragic. Throughout its uneven course the Armenians have seldom enjoyed peace and rest in their homeland for any length of time. Their homeland, had been the bridge, as well as the battleground, of invading and conquering forces, from the east and from the west, and because of that geographic fact they have suffered in the course of wars between Rome and Persia between Byzantium and the Arabs, between Byzantium and the Turks. Numerous times their country was partitioned between Rome and Persia.

Early in the fifth century, nearly the whole country became part of Persia, and every effort was made by Persian rulers to have Armenians renounce their Christian religion.

A bitter religious war was fought in 451, one in which the Armenians were the losers, but they still refused to yield to superior Persian power on matters of conscience. By clinging to their Christian faith, they claimed moral victory over Persian authorities.

Toward the middle of the seventh century Armenia was overrun and conquered by the Arabs—and for some 250 years, Armenians lived under the ruthless Arab governors appointed by caliphs of Damascus and Baghdad.

In the late ninth century, as the Arab rule weakened, Armenians asserted their freedom, regained a good measure of independence and then for about 200 years lived in freedom and glory in the northern part of the country. That period was the medieval Golden Age of Armenia.

By the middle of the 11th century, Asiatic invaders—Suljuk Turks—were harassing the Armenians on their eastern borders. In 1071, the last Armenian stronghold surrendered to these invaders. Large groups of Armenians fled the country—seeking refuge and eventual homes in other lands. Thus late in the 11th century began the Armenian diaspora, the dispersion of Armenians from their historic homeland. Despite this, the majority of the population refused to abandon their native land and remained there until their extermination in 1915.

During the next several centuries, Armenians in Armenia endured all the hardships caused and brutalities committed by their Asiatic conquerors. Certain Turkish tribes replaced others as rulers of the land. As time went on, the number of invading peoples increased while the number of Armenians inevitably decreased through emigration, forced conversion to Islam and also through wanton massacres. Early in the 16th century, most of the country and the majority of Armenians were brought under the rule of the Ottoman Sultans. This did not improve the lot of the Armenian people. The Armenians were fated to suffer under their new masters as they had suffered under others—and for 400 years they endured their unenviable lot.

They made the best of a very bad situation, and through it all more than a million of them managed to survive in their homeland until the outbreak of the First World War.

And then came their national tragedy. Then came the day that we commemorate this day. Martyr's day. This day, marked by Armenians the world over, retells the brutal massacres by the Turkish rulers in April of 1915. Fifty years usually notes a golden anniversary. But not this event.

This event and this day commemorate one of the most tragic pages in the history of mankind. Think of it. Over a million Armenians massacred. This barbarous, inhuman sacrifice of human life has been exceeded in the world's history only by the insane actions of Hitler against the Jews in World War II.

And so we gather this day so that the world will never forget what happened 50 years ago to a brave and resolute people.

Is this occasion and the many, many like it throughout the world, an exercise in futility and frustration? No. I think not. The world must pause and reflect and point with shame to the events that this martyr's day brings to mind. It must not be allowed to forget. For the placid acceptance of the Armenian tragedy of 1915 begets the danger of repetition.

So I come to join with you in this meaningful occasion. To congratulate you on keeping the memory of your national tragedy alive—to commend you for your magnificent adherence to the cause of Christianity—to compliment you for not forgetting.

I express the gratitude of this Government for the contributions you have made and are making to this Nation. Your culture, your attractiveness, your intelligence, your spirit, have spread the world over. This Nation has been the beneficiary of these attributes and the United States of America appreciates them.

PROGRAM

Invocation: The Reverend Emerson W. Smith, executive director, Council of Churches of Greater Springfield.

Dinner.

Message: Carnig Philigian, chairman, board of trustees, St. Gregory Armenian Apostolic Church.

Armenian recitation: Mrs. Ardashus A. Aykanian, Mrs. Nishan H. Vartanian.

Honored guests: The Honorable Charles V. Ryan, mayor of Springfield; the Honorable EDWARD P. BOLAND, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

Armenian address: The Very Reverend Khachadour Guiragossian, St. Gregory Armenian Apostolic Church.

Choir: St. Gregory Armenian Apostolic Church.

Address: The Most Reverend Christopher J. Weldon, bishop of the Springfield Diocese. Hayr Mer.

Benediction: The Very Reverend Khachadour Guiragossian.

Chairman of Armenian Martyrs' Day Observance: Ardashus A. Aykanian.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, the tragic story of Turkey's brutal slaughter of 1½ million Armenians in 1915 is a record of infamy to match the worst of the atrocities which have so filled and so defiled this century of human history. The genocide of this little nation which was America's staunch ally ranks with the crimes of Red China or of Nazi Germany. Indeed, Hitler himself drew from the fate of the Armenians inspiration to move forward in his war of extermination against Poland. To the military commanders of the Third Reich at Obersalzberg on August 22, 1939, he said:

Our strength is in our quickness and our brutality. * * * I have given the order, and will have everyone shot who utters one word of criticism. * * * Thus for the time being I have sent to the east only my Death's Heads

with the order to kill without pity or mercy all men, women, and children of the Polish race or language. Who still talks nowadays of the extermination of the Armenians?

He did well to cite the terrible fate of these brave people as his example, for this genocide by Turkey set the pattern for the other mass exterminations of our time.

This was, however, not even 50 years ago, a new pattern for the Turks. In a long record of systematic slaughter of Armenians, Greeks, and other groups, it has been estimated that Turkey has been responsible for the deaths of some 2,600,000 persons in a series of acts of genocide stretching from 1822 until the present time.

It is worthy of mention that in this 50th anniversary year of the Armenian tragedy, the nation responsible is engaged in another conflict, this time against America's friend of longstanding and staunch ally, the nation of Greece.

It is my profound hope that in this conflict we will neither be unmindful of Turkey's demonstrated propensity for violence and cruelty, or Greece's long and strong traditions of Christian faith and morality and of friendship for the United States. It is my further hope that as we remember the tragedy of these noble friends of yesterday, we shall be redetermined to keep faith with and act responsibly toward our friends of the here and now, so that nevermore shall an ally of this country suffer the terrible fate at the hands of Turkey that did the brave Armenians whose memory we honor this day.

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, half a century ago the people of Armenia suffered perhaps the first attempt at genocide in modern times. The Government of the Turkish Empire instituted a plan which led to the massacre of 1 million people and uprooted from their homes another 1 million. This terrible crime against humanity has gone virtually unnoticed through the years; in fact, Hitler, in 1939, contemptuously asked:

Who still talks nowadays of the extermination of the Armenians?

To reemphasize that sad history Armenians in the United States have established a commemorative committee on the 50th anniversary of the Turkish massacre of the Armenians. I congratulate them on this effort, for the terrible episode they commemorate should be ever present in our minds as further evidence of man's inhumanity to man. We must ever be aware that such terrible things can happen.

In recent days we have learned of wholesale murders in the Dominican Republic. In another part of the world we rightly fear that our withdrawal from Vietnam would lead to the mass murder and persecution of those who have gallantly fought to defend their land.

Even this terrible trial was not the end of troubles for the people of Armenia, for after becoming a free country in 1918, Communists invaded the army and labor unions and attempted an uprising, which was suppressed. Thereafter Russia made a secret deal with

Turkey whereby Turkey would attack Armenia from the south and Russia would begin harrassing action on the north. In 1920 Russia offered Armenia a treaty, which amounted to an ultimatum. Despite a guarantee of sovereignty, Russia took over on December 2, 1920. The Russian treatment of the Armenians was so cruel that on February 19, 1921, an outraged people threw out the Communist government and established their independence.

Upon reorganization of the independent Republic, Prime Minister Simon Veratzaian appealed to the free world to help keep Armenia free. No aid came, however. In August 1921, great concentrations of Soviet military forces broke down Armenia's military resistance.

So the troubles of the Armenian people have been many, but at least in the commemoration of their great tragedy in 1915, we can perhaps renew our belief in the freedom and dignity of man and rededicate ourselves to prevent further occurrences of genocide wherever and whenever they may occur.

Mr. ROUDEBUSH. Mr. Speaker, the year 1965 marks the 50th anniversary of the saddest and most tragic event in the long and proud history of the Armenian people.

The Armenians, although the smallest of the Allied nations to participate in the struggle against Germany and Turkey in World War I, contributed more to the Allied cause in terms of casualties than any other single Allied state, large or small.

More than 1,500,000 Armenians perished during the Turkish genocide in the years 1915-18.

It is important that this event not be allowed to pass without the citizens of the United States of America pausing a moment in tribute to the memory of these martyrs.

It is important that we Americans know that these brave Armenians gave their lives so that the cause of virtuous democratic government, freedom, justice and human rights be served; and in advancing that cause, the Armenian victims advanced the cause of America and that of all freedom-loving countries in this world.

Such great sacrifices and devotion to the cause of freedom must not be forgotten in this year 1965, one-half century removed from the tragic events of 1915.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the subject of my special order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

SITUATION IN THE DOMINICAN REPUBLIC

Mr. SELDEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House

for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. SELDEN. Mr. Speaker, the revolt which brought a request from the Dominican military for assistance in protecting the lives of U.S. citizens made the action of President Johnson last evening not only necessary but urgent as well.

In a report issued only last week, the House Subcommittee on Inter-American Affairs, of which I am chairman, pointed out that recent failures of the Communists in Latin America only increase the possibility that they will now seek to extend their influence in that area by violence and by terrorist activities. While the situation in the Dominican Republic is far from stable at this moment, there is every indication that the rebel forces are now controlled by leftist, Communist, and Castro elements.

In my opinion, the President acted wisely in sending U.S. Marines to the Dominican Republic to protect the lives of U.S. citizens. Developments in that country should be watched carefully, as there is every indication the Communists are attempting to exploit the situation.

ECONOMIC WARFARE AND ECONOMIC SUICIDE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. ROGERS) is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include a table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, the Soviet Union is openly engaged in an all-out effort to bury us—at sea.

This point can best be illustrated by the high priority which the Kremlin has assigned to the construction of ships for the Russian merchant and naval fleets. There can be little doubt that the Soviet Union is determined to control the oceans and trade routes of the world. As a naval power, she is already second only to the United States. As a maritime power, experts predict she will surpass the United States in less than 2 years. Because of her enormous fleet expansion program, the Soviet Union may soon be able to manipulate world ocean freight rates at will, and through a superiority in terms of numbers of ships, she may be well on the road to economic domination of the world. The weight of numbers will soon begin to tell.

As of February 1, 1965, 612 merchant vessels of various sizes and types—mostly dry cargo ships and tankers—totaling more than 4,197,200 deadweight tons were on order or under construction for the Soviet Union. With her own shipyards fully utilized, this tremendous building program is being accomplished

by awards of sizable contracts to shipyards in East Germany, England, Finland, Holland, Hungary, Japan, Norway, Poland, Sweden, and Yugoslavia.

During the 3-month period from November 1964 through January 1965, the Soviet Union accepted delivery of 27 dry cargo ships. By comparison, U.S. shipyards delivered only 16 merchant vessels during the entire year of 1964. Moreover, it needs to be pointed out that other satellites in the Communist orbit—Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, East Germany, Hungary, Poland, Red China, Rumania, Soviet Cuba, and Yugoslavia—are also participating in this maritime buildup. As will be seen from the attached tabulation, the Soviet bloc countries are building another 173 oceangoing vessels totaling more than 2,031,964 deadweight tons.

The extensive building program has obviously not been undertaken merely to serve Soviet foreign trade or as a military contingency, but must represent the Communists' approach to the cold war on the economic front, and recognition of ships as instruments of major economic influence. The present Soviet merchant shipbuilding effort alone is more than 10 times that of the United States. Nearly 2 million tons of the vessels under construction for the Russian flag are being built in Russian shipyards—an activity level 3 times that of U.S. shipyards. It should be noted that the Soviet Union has placed shipbuilding contracts with other countries—including some of our friends in the community of free nations—only because of this high degree of utilization of her own shipyard capacity.

As of February 1, 1965, there were 44 commercial vessels, totaling about 613,829 deadweight tons, on order or under construction in the United States. These involved 2 tankers, 39 cargo vessels, and 3 ferryboats. In other words, the Russians are building 15 times as many merchant ships as we are. In terms of tonnage, they are outbuilding us by a ratio of 7 to 1. And, I might add, the Soviet Union is committing large domestic resources and a substantial portion of its foreign exchange to enlarging its merchant fleet.

While the Communists are building a new and modern sea power potential, almost half of our naval fleet is composed of vessels 20 years of age and older. In less than 2 years, more than two-thirds of our Navy fleet will be overage. About 90 percent of all U.S.-flag dry cargo ships and 55 percent of our U.S.-flag tankers are 20 years of age or older. Our fleet of dry cargo ships engaged in domestic trades is virtually extinct. The average age of the ships in our Great Lakes fleet is 47 years. Our private shipyards are more than 50 percent idle. And, U.S.-flag shipping is carrying only 5 percent of our export and import commercial cargoes.

About these facts and figures, it is virtually impossible to find an adjective which would appropriately describe the depth of my concern and alarm. Our national security is at stake—so, too, is the collective security of the Western

Hemisphere and the entire free world. Every new ship delivered to Russia by any shipyard on this side of the Iron Curtain nourishes the ever-extending arm of Soviet economic tyranny. It is particularly ironic that Spain—with whom we have a mutual security pact and with whom we conducted a large-scale military amphibious assault exercise only several months ago—has accepted contracts to build ships for Soviet Cuba. The necessary funds can probably be traced to the Kremlin.

One of the experts on this problem, Mr. Vincent F. Caputo, Director for Transportation and Warehousing Policy in the Office of the Secretary of Defense, stated recently:

Spearheading the economic warfare of the U.S.S.R. is the oil offensive. In struggling for the world's petroleum markets, the U.S.S.R. has the oil, and can undercut the Western competitive prices. But it needs the tankers and pipelines that it cannot construct itself.

It has asked the West to make the boomeranging poison darts that will ultimately undo the maker. And the West—a part of the West—has naively agreed to thus contribute to its own economic suicide.

Last year the Soviet bloc was building 10 tankers in its own yards. But it can't meet the needs of its grand economic warfare strategy. So 43 tankers are being built for the bloc in the free world yards.

Once in a position to control the seas and the trade routes of the world, the hammer and sickle fleet will be able to force the ships of other nations into layup. To exploit Communist strategy, ocean freight rates will be deliberately and adroitly manipulated to undermine, bankrupt, and eventually eliminate free world shipping. Then, we may witness the display of Communist ships serving American ports.

There is another aspect to our present predicament. We also have the anomaly of witnessing the rapid decline of U.S.-flag passenger ships at a time when the Soviet Union and other countries are vying with one another in the construction and operation of luxury-class vessels. While in this country there are no oceangoing passenger ships on order, elsewhere in the world 43 are presently under construction, and 16 of these are for the Russians.

Press dispatches of January 3, 1965, reported Soviet Russia's ambition to operate regular passenger liner service between Odessa and New York.

Agreement has already been reached on new transatlantic passenger service between Leningrad and Montreal with stop at Helsinki, Stockholm, Southampton, and LeHavre. Russia's desire for a passenger service link with the United States was expressed last year when Soviet Merchant Marine Minister Victor Bakayev stated in a Moscow press conference:

It is our dream to have them (the new Franko-class of luxury liners being built in East German shipyards) operate on a Soviet-American service between Odessa and New York.

All of this takes place while the United States apparently has decided to abandon passenger trade. All of this takes

place despite actions by the Congress more than 5 years ago authorizing the construction of two superliners to augment the U.S. fleet—one for the Pacific and one for the Atlantic service.

It is clear that we are relaxing while the Communists aggressively build more ships and expand their maritime strength. Have we failed to recognize the real aims of Communist ideology?

Much public attention must be focused on this problem. The solution can be found only through nationwide resolution, stating in effect that America needs and wants a strong merchant marine. A first step could be taken by this Government, acting in the interests of the American people to preserve and build a strong merchant fleet for the sake of national defense. A first approach may well be increasing the requirement that U.S. Government-generated cargoes be shipped aboard American merchant ships. Is the present requirement that 50 percent of U.S. Government cargoes be carried by our own ships and crews sufficient? I do not think it is. More Government cargoes for our own shippers would help their business, create demand for more ships to be built, and cause adjustments in our national maritime policies. And cutting down the amount of U.S. Government cargoes shipped aboard foreign-flag ships would certainly cut down the outflow of U.S. gold. This step would surely be appropriate for the Government to take.

To serve the national interests on the oceans and Great Lakes, where foreign shippers have penetrated to the point where they carry the majority of cargoes transported into the heartland of America, a reappraisal is in order. We must note the difference between destructive pennypinching and constructive investments.

The American people must be awakened to the threat that faces us on the oceans. We must recognize the wisdom of engaging in realistic maritime and shipbuilding programs. We must realize the time for action is now. To delay longer could be disastrous.

As part of my remarks I ask that the following table be included:

Communist shipbuilding contracts on order as of Jan. 31, 1965

| | Number | Deadweight tons |
|--|------------|------------------|
| Soviet Russia: | | |
| Dry cargo vessels..... | 427 | 2,269,900 |
| Tankers..... | 120 | 1,769,800 |
| Bulk carriers..... | 7 | 137,500 |
| Passenger and specialized vessels..... | 58 | (1) |
| Total..... | 612 | 4,197,200 |
| Poland: | | |
| Dry cargo vessels..... | 71 | 531,400 |
| Bulk carriers..... | 6 | 135,000 |
| Total..... | 77 | 666,400 |
| Yugoslavia: | | |
| Dry cargo vessels..... | 18 | 139,000 |
| Tankers..... | 8 | 264,000 |
| Bulk carriers..... | 11 | 320,000 |
| Passenger and specialized vessels..... | 4 | (1) |
| Total..... | 41 | 723,000 |

See footnote at end of table.

Communist shipbuilding contracts on order as of Jan. 31, 1965—Continued

| | Number | Dead-weight tons |
|--|--------|------------------|
| Bulgaria: | | |
| Dry cargo vessels..... | 5 | 41, 295 |
| Tankers..... | 2 | 49, 900 |
| Total..... | 7 | 91, 195 |
| Rumania: | | |
| Dry cargo vessels..... | 6 | 38, 500 |
| Tankers..... | 2 | 71, 900 |
| Bulk carriers..... | 8 | 204, 000 |
| Total..... | 16 | 314, 400 |
| Red China: | | |
| Dry cargo vessels..... | 5 | 70, 660 |
| Specialized vessels..... | 1 | (¹) |
| Total..... | 6 | 70, 660 |
| Soviet Cuba: | | |
| Dry cargo vessels..... | 8 | 81, 709 |
| Specialized vessels..... | 2 | (¹) |
| Total..... | 10 | 81, 709 |
| East Germany: Dry cargo vessels..... | 14 | 69, 200 |
| Czechoslovakia: Dry cargo vessel..... | 1 | 12, 700 |
| Hungary: Dry cargo vessel..... | 1 | 2, 700 |
| Total..... | 785 | 6, 229, 164 |

¹ Not available.

Source: Fairplay Shipping Journal, "World Ships on Order," February 1965.

SUPPORT FOR PRESIDENT JOHNSON'S ACTION IN DOMINICAN REPUBLIC CRISIS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. FASCELL] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, President Johnson's action in sending the U.S. Marines into the Dominican Republic to protect the lives of American citizens caught in the attempted revolt, is urgent and necessary and I fully support it.

Furthermore, it appears that the revolutionary group is infiltrated by Castro Communists and they are attempting to take over the Dominican Republic.

The United States should promptly support the request for assistance by any anti-Communist provisional government so that this attempted takeover can be quashed.

The Organization of American States acting under article 39 of the charter of the OAS should immediately send an observation group to the Dominican Republic to assure the Latin American countries and the other nations as to what is transpiring and to insure the return of a democratic government to the people of Santo Domingo.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FASCELL. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I want to say that I commend the gentleman for his comments and I agree with him. It is my sincere hope that the President's actions represent a foreshadowing of the new approach that our Government will use in its foreign policy, that wherever the lives of Americans are in danger in any part of the world, the President will use whatever strength and force is necessary to give protection to American nationals.

STATUTES, REGULATIONS, POLICIES, AND PRACTICES OF SELECTED FOREIGN COUNTRIES PROVIDING FOR PREFERENCES FOR DOMESTIC MATERIALS AND FIRMS IN THE AWARDED OF PUBLIC SUPPLY AND PUBLIC WORKS CONTRACTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SAYLOR] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, continuing the series of findings developed out of a study of the public purchasing policies of leading industrial nations doing business with the United States, I am today presenting the third of a series of documents that first appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on April 27. The set to be included at the end of my remarks relates to the policies and practices of France, Germany, Italy, Greece, and Turkey.

As this series is continued, Members of Congress can understand more clearly and to appreciate more sympathetically why American industry and labor cry out against the U.S. Government's insistence on buying with tax funds for public use the products of alien industry and labor when the facilities and manpower to make them are available at our own plants.

Why, we ask, are U.S. Treasury funds expended outside this country at the expense of this Nation's work force?

Why, when our unfavorable balance-of-payments position threatens our whole monetary stability, are Federal dollars not kept at home whenever practicable?

Why is our own self-interest ignored when our friends abroad are so careful to exclude use of American products for public works projects?

It would be naive to suggest that the U.S. Government is pursuing its anomalous course as a gambit or stratagem to induce reciprocal treatment, for by now it must be obvious even to the most stubborn doctrinaire that the most friendly governments are not so magnanimous as to make contracts with outsiders while home industries and workers go begging.

The one remaining question, Mr. Speaker, is: How much longer must we tolerate Federal frivolity favoring foreign fiduciaries?

Following is part three of the series:

FRANCE

(Member of EEC, GATT, and OECD)

French Government contracts are generally governed by the Public Contracts Code established by Decree No. 64-729 of July 17, 1964 (Journal Officiel, July 21, 1964, p. 6438), which is for the most part a codification of a large number of earlier decrees and other regulatory provisions.

The Code provides for the following principal methods of letting contracts:

1. Open public tendering (adjudication ouverte): bidding is open to all interested persons.
2. Restricted public tendering (adjudication restreinte): Only persons approved by the contracting authority may submit bids.
3. Open invitation for bids (appel d'offres ouvert): Bidding is open to all interested persons.

4. Restricted invitation for bids (appel d'offres restreint): Only persons approved by the contracting authority may submit bids.

5. Private contract (marché de gré à gré): The contract may be negotiated with a supplier or contractor selected by the contracting authority.

The Code also provides for a special type of competitive invitation for bids (appel d'offres avec concours), which is authorized when technical, aesthetic or financial considerations justify special research, such as a proposal for a new public building of modern design. The competition takes place on the basis of a program drawn up by the contracting authority.

Both types of public tendering and the open invitation for bids must be preceded by advertisement in the official bulletin published for that purpose and in other media, such as trade and technical journals. Most government departments maintain lists of approved suppliers and contractors and written application must be made to each department for inclusion on its list. The lists are used in the selection of suppliers and contractors who are to be contacted in the case of restricted invitations for bids as well as the negotiation of private contracts. An unofficial translation from French of the application form of the PTT (Posts, Telegraphs and Telephones Administration) is attached hereto.

In the case of public tendering the contracting authority must award the contract to the lowest bidder, provided the price does not exceed the stipulated maximum and subject, in the case of open public tendering, to the right of the contracting authority to exclude bidders whom it regards as presenting insufficient moral, financial or technical qualifications.

In the case of invitations for offers the contracting authority need not accept the lowest bid and may accept the bid which it deems the most advantageous (la plus intéressante) according to objective criteria set forth in the Code.

Except for the private contract method, the contracting authority has complete discretion to select the method by which the contract is to be let. Theoretically, the use of the private contract method is limited to the special cases specified in the Code.

In any case the contracting authority always retains the right to reject every bid and to order the bidding procedure repeated. In the case of invitations for bids, the contracting authority may elect to negotiate a private contract.

Under the provisions of article 104 of the code that method of awarding contracts may be used for items of exclusive manufacture, for negotiating with owners of patents or inventors, or persons with exclusive rights to patents or inventions; in cases for which the technical problems and investments require the use of direct agreement, for products which must be bought at the place of production or at the stockpile, for work and services carried out at research centers in places of experimentation, etc.; whenever bidding by other methods has proved unacceptable to the contracting authority; for products and supplies as to which, on account of the shortage of material it is impossible to employ competitive bidding; when the enterprises and persons who were previously awarded contracts failed to carry them out and they are awarded to others at their risk and peril; in cases of shipping by public transportation services; and for all work, supplies and services which, due to urgency, are motivated by unforeseeable circumstances; for all those which, in the interest of the nation, must be kept secret or for any similar work, supply or service concerning national defense.

As the result of the broad interpretation given by the administrative authorities to the special cases permitting the use of the

private contract method, which the code and previous statutory and other provisions on which it is based regard as the exceptional method, it is in fact the one most frequently used. According to the December 1964 issue of "Marchés Publics" [public contracts] published by the French Ministry of Finance and Economic Affairs, during the calendar year 1963 contracts concluded by open or restricted public tendering represented 1 percent of the total value of all contracts, contracts concluded by open invitations for bids 6.4 percent, contracts concluded by restricted invitations for bids 33 percent, and private contracts 58.8 percent. During that year the military contracting authorities continued to use the private contract and restricted procedures in preference to open procedures much more frequently than the civilian contracting authorities.

In practice, therefore, there is ample opportunity for discrimination against foreign bidders.

Under the provisions of decree No. 60-724 of July 25, 1960 (Journal Officiel, July 27, 1960), contracts of the departments, communes, departmental and communal public establishments, urban districts and other local and municipal entities, including the City of Paris, are governed in general by the same rules as French government contracts. The 1960 Decree does not, however, suppress the supremacy of public tendering, as does the Public Contracts Code, and grants much less discretion to use the invitation for offers method and the private contract method.

The 1964 code is not applicable to nationalized industries or state monopolies or to corporations wholly or partly owned by the state. Their procurement practices are essentially the same as those of private enterprises, although the provisions of the Code naturally have considerable influence.

In many cases, government contracts may be reserved for French nationals by the terms of the request for tenders or the invitation for offers. That situation is expressly recognized in the "Guide de Fournisseur de L'Etat" (Guide for the State Contractor) published in 1964 by the Commission Centrale des Marchés (Central Contracts Commission). The Guide states (page 12) that foreign suppliers can submit bids subject to having satisfied, if necessary, the conditions prevailing for importations of goods, but that in certain cases the French citizenship of the contractors is required. The French Council of State has held, however, that the contracting authority does not have the power to reject a bidder by reason of his foreign nationality, if the exclusion of foreigners was not expressly provided for by a provision of the law or of the General Contract Specifications. An example of such a provision is Section 2 of Article 6 of the General Administrative Clauses applicable to contracts for current supplies (fournitures courantes) approved by Decree No. 62-1510 of December 14, 1962 (Journal Officiel, December 16, 1962), which provides that, subject to not contravening the stipulations of international agreements, the Minister can decide that the bidders must be of French nationality. The decision must be mentioned in the notice of public tendering or invitation for bids. The notice must also specify the nature of the documents to be furnished by way of proof of nationality. According to the treatise by Hainaut and Joliet cited *infra* (volume 1, section 104 bis), similar provisions are contained in the General Contract Specifications of the Ministry of War (article 11) and the Ministry of the Navy (article 2), the General Contract Specifications for Military Supplies (article 21), the General Contract Specifications for Public Works of the P.T.T. (Posts, Telegraph and Telephones Administration) (Article 2) and the General Contract Specifications for Public Works of the City of Paris (Article 2).

In the field of military procurement and works contracts, specific regulatory provisions have the effect of reserving orders (except on very rare occasions) to purely French companies. Section 2 of Article 30 of the Arrêté (Order) of the Minister of National Defense and Armed Forces of May 7, 1958 (Journal Officiel, May 29, 1958, p. 5111), approving the General Administrative Clauses applicable to industrial contract of the Departments of National Defense, provides as follows (unofficial translation from French): "2. Unless authorized by the Minister [of National Defense] and subject to the supplemental provisions of Article 33 relating to war materiel, allocation of orders can only be obtained by:

"Physical persons who are nationals of the French Union;

"Corporate bodies which are not, in law or in fact, subject to foreign influences which the contracting authority would consider incompatible with the requirements of national defense."

The provisions of Article 33 of the same Ministerial Order relating to orders for "war materiel" imply that enterprises manufacturing such equipment must be French or at least must manufacture in France. The provisions of that Article are as follows (unofficial translation from French):

"1. In addition to the obligations provided for in Art. 30, every candidate for a 'war materiel' contract must fulfill the special legal and regulatory obligations concerning such materiel, and in particular:

"Special nationality requirements;

"Obtaining a manufacturing license or a sales authorization;

"Control of the management;

"Maintenance of net price accounting in compliance with the provisions of Article 34 below;

"These provisions apply to concession holders, to sub-contractors as well as to sub-suppliers ['sous-commandiers'] who are themselves manufacturing components classified as war materiel.

"2. If, in an exceptional case, the State should give formal notice of a war contract to an enterprise which does not hold a manufacturing license or sales authorization for the materiel concerned, such notice shall take the place, for such enterprise and for the materiel under consideration, of a manufacturing license or sales authorization.

"During the entire duration of the execution of the contract, the enterprise shall remain subject to all legally enacted regulations which apply to license holders.

"Not later than one month after the giving of formal notice of such contract, the enterprise must deposit with the competent authority a file containing the documents laid down for all requests for a manufacturing license or sales authorization for the materiel which forms the subject of the contract.

"In case of non-compliance with this time-limit, the holder is liable to fines which, in the absence of respective regulation in the contract, shall be computed at the rate of 1/2 per mil of the amount of the contract per day of delay."

Under the provisions of Article 1 of the Decree-Law of April 18, 1939 (Journal Officiel, June 13, 1939, p. 1589) the term "war materiel" is defined as firearms and ammunition conceived or intended for land, naval or aerial war and materiel intended to carry or employ such firearms in combat.

Article 2 of the same Decree-Law provides that enterprises manufacturing or engaging in the purchase and sale of "war materiel" cannot operate without the previous authorization of the State and under its control, pursuant to the conditions prescribed by decree. Article 5 of the Decree of August 14, 1939, for the implementation of such Article 2 and following Articles (Journal Officiel, August 19, 1939, p. 10438)

provides that, in order to receive a manufacturing license, a corporation (société par actions) must be of French nationality, must be managed and directed by French citizens and the majority of its capital must be held by French citizens.

In the field of public works, article 21 of the General Administrative Clauses applicable to public works contracts entered into in the name of the State established by Decree No. 61-529 of May 8, 1961 (Journal Officiel, May 31, 1961, p. 4915), provides for preferences for materials, etc., of French origin in the following terms (unofficial translation from French):

"5. With the exception of provisions arising from international treaties or agreements, where applicable, all materials, materiel, machines, apparatus, tools and appliances used for the execution of the works must be of French origin.

"6. With the same exception, special deviations may be provided for in the special contract specifications or may be granted in the course of the contract by ministerial decision."

The reference to international treaties and agreements is obviously intended to take into account the provisions of the Treaty of Rome, particularly those relating to the right of establishment and the free provision of services.

Article 3 of the same decree requires the submission with bids of proof of the nationality of the bidder and its personnel as required by the tender notice or the invitation for offers, if the contract is entered into for defense requirements.

The opportunities for preference in favor of French contractors and French materials in practice and under the applicable regulatory provisions are described in the following statement contained (pages 8-9) in the letter dated December 10, 1963, from Maître Jean L. Sarrut and Maître Bernard Siegler, cited *infra*.

"(b) Our public authorities have various possibilities to put aside foreign suppliers: "In connection with national defense they may invoke the above referred regulations; "They may raise the import duties;

"In connection with adjudications they may put aside the foreign tenderers, in the same manner as French tenderers who, in their opinion, do not fulfill the required conditions, without any recourse being possible;

"In connection with the 'appels d'offres' and the 'marchés de gré à gré' they may choose French suppliers without contacting foreign suppliers.

"Another means may consist, in connection with contracts concerning equipment of materiel, for example, in requiring such characteristics concerning the materiel that only French equipment can comply with.

"(c) In fact, certain of these means are indisputably used in some cases in France. In connection with national defense, for example, it might happen that French suppliers be selected, although their prices are much higher than those of foreign suppliers.

"But according to the information that we have gathered, the preference in favor of French suppliers has certain limits:

"The preference for French suppliers will not play if French prices are fairly higher than foreign ones. If, for example, foreign equipment costs, say 10 percent less than French equipment, our public authorities will hesitate to order French equipment as such decision might be criticized by the public control accountants.

"Also there are cases when, by reason of economic policy, for example when the French prices are going up, our public authorities buy abroad deliberately.

"All this is not theoretical, and we know, for example that our public authorities in charge of the manufacturing of French coins made abroad substantial orders which might have been passed in France. Also certain

employers' federations complain about the fact that our public authorities pass too often contracts abroad."

The situation in the field of civilian government procurement is succinctly and accurately summarized in a publication entitled "France's Fifth Republic and the Business World" published in 1963 by Business International S.A., as follows (at page 31):

"Foreign companies can sell to civilian state 'markets' whether they manufacture in France or import, provided they abide by import regulations. There is no equivalent of the 'Buy American Act' in France. But in the absence of written regulations and presuming equal prices and services, the 'love-rate' (cote d'amour) is applied in favor of national suppliers, a reaction that the Commission Centrale [des Marchés] calls 'visceral.'"

The situation in France was confirmed by a conversation which two members of the United States Embassy in Paris had in April 1960 with Mr. Paul Gros, then Chief Purchasing Officer of the French State Railways and at the same time President of the French Association of Purchasing Agents, and a Mr. Dumas, of the Government Procurement Committee. The conversation is reported in Foreign Service Despatch No. 1585 (unclassified) dated April 12, 1960, from the United States Embassy in Paris to the Department of State. Messrs. Gros and Dumas were reported as stating that, while there are no legislative or administrative regulations corresponding to the Federal Buy American Act in France, preference would generally be given to the French suppliers without any official requirement to do so. Mr. Gros is also reported as stating that for a non-French firm to be seriously considered as a potential supplier, its bid would have to be 20 percent to 30 percent below the lowest French bid.

PRINCIPAL SOURCES

(1) Letter dated December 10, 1963, from Maître Jean L. Sarrut and Maître Bernard Siegler, Avocats à la Cour d'Appel, Paris, letter dated May 28, 1964 from Maître Siegler and letter dated November 6, 1964, from Maître Sarrut, all to Cravath, Swaine & Moore, Paris.

(2) Foreign Service Despatch No. 1585 dated April 12, 1960, from the United States Embassy in Paris entitled "EXPORT: Public Procurement Methods in France".

(3) Business International, S.A., "France's Fifth Republic and the Business World" (Geneva, Switzerland, 1963).

(4) Commission Centrale des Marchés (France), "Guide du Fournisseur de l'État" [Guide for the State Contractor] (Paris, 1964).

(5) de Grand Ry, "L'Harmonisation des Législations au sein du Marché Commun en Matière de Marchés Publics" [The Harmonization of Laws concerning Public Contracts in the Common Market], Revue de Marché Commun (No. 37) pp. 247-251 (No. 38), pp. 282-292 (1961).

(6) Hainaut and Joliet, "Les Contrats de Travaux et de Fournitures de l'Administration dans le Marché Commun" [Public Works and Supply Contracts in the Common Market], vol. 1 (Brussels, 1962), vol. 2 (1963).

Posts—Telegraphs—Telephones

FORM OF GENERAL INFORMATION FOR SUPPLY CONTRACTS [FRANCE]

(Unofficial translation from French)

I. Administrative and Legal Information

A. to be furnished by all candidates:

Correct name of enterprise.....

Address and telephone number:

(a) of business seat.....

(b) of plants, workshops or storage places where the supplies will be manufactured or kept.....

Posts—Telegraphs—Telephones—Continued

FORM OF GENERAL INFORMATION FOR SUPPLY CONTRACTS [FRANCE]—continued

Manner of working: working owner.....; lessee-manager (state since what date)*

B. to be furnished by companies only:

Juridical form (example: stock company, limited liability company, partnership limited by shares).....

Business capital.....

Date of information.....

Persons authorized to bind the company in matters of contracts:

Name.....

Office.....

Nationality.....

Authorizing documents.....

(1) President-director general, manager, commercial director, etc.

(2) As applicable: by-laws, board of directors' resolutions dated....., etc.

II. Technical Information

1. Activities of the enterprise:

(a) List current manufactures:.....

(b) Do you wish to be consulted on all these manufactures or only on certain among them? (In that case, list them):.....

2. Area of plants, workshops, or storage spaces indicated on page 1 under 1-A, section b:.....

3. Personnel force used: Total number:.....

of which..... laborers.

4. Energy used: Nature and power:.....

5. Machines and installations comprising plant equipment (list with indication of power and maximum capacity of each):.....

GERMAN FEDERAL REPUBLIC

(Member of EEC, GATT and OECD)

The only statutory provision relating to public procurement in the Federal Republic of Germany is the Reich Public Budget Regulation (Reichshaushaltsordnung) adopted December 31, 1922, and now in effect as last revised on April 30, 1938. Section 46 of the Regulation provides as follows (unofficial translation from German):

"(1) Contracts made for the account of the Reich must be preceded by public tender, unless the nature of the transaction or special circumstances justify a deviation.

"(2) The Government of the Reich shall establish uniform principles for the making of contracts."

The public budget laws of the Länder (States) contain similar provisions.

The basic provisions which are applied by public procurement authorities are:

(1) Regulations for the Placing of Public Orders—Except those in the Construction Industry (Verdingungsordnung für Leistungen—ausgenommen Bauleistungen) (VOL); and

(2) Regulations for the Placing of Construction Contracts (Verdingungsordnung für Bauleistungen) (VOB).

The VOL and the VOB are not mandatory legal provisions but only general principles drafted by specialists and considered by them to constitute the best procedures. They have, however, been made binding on federal government departments and agencies and the Länder by means of administrative circulars.¹ The VOL applies to most government departments, including the Ministry of Defense, the Ministry of Posts and Telecommunications (PTT), the State Railways, the Ministry of the Interior and the Ministry for Economic Property. The VOB is applicable

* Strike out one or the other, as applicable.

¹ The current (1960) edition of the VOL was confirmed in effect with amendments by a Circular dated May 11, 1960, of the Federal Ministers of Economic Property and Economy. The current (1952) edition of the VOB was promulgated by a Circular dated April 23, 1953, of the Federal Ministers of Finance, Trade and PTT.

to all public works financed by means of federal credits. All nine Länder have also adopted both the VOL and the VOB and they are also binding on the municipalities.

Section 3 of the VOL and Section 3 of the VOB prescribe the following methods for the letting of contracts:

(1) Public invitation for offers (öffentliche Ausschreibung)—invitations for offers are made to an unrestricted number of firms by publication in the Bundesauschreibungsblatt (Federal Bulletin for the Invitation of Offers) and in the Bundesanzeiger (Federal Bulletin) as well as in daily newspapers and trade journals.

(2) Restricted invitation for offers (beschränkte Ausschreibung)—limited invitation for offers addressed privately to selected firms.

(3) Direct procurement (freihändige Vergabe)—contracts are awarded without formal proceedings in the discretion of the contracting authorities, usually on the basis of informal offers by at least three firms.

The first method is the standard one, but is used principally for construction contracts and even then accounts for only about one-third of such contracts in value. The second method may be used, if the nature and extent of the order or work demands special reliability, capability, or competence. The third method may be used in the restricted cases specified in the VOL and the VOB. In practice, however, the applicable provisions of the VOL and VOB are liberally interpreted by the contracting authorities, with the result that the method to be used is largely in their complete discretion.

In any event, even in the case of a public invitation for offers, the contracting authority is under a duty to accept the offer which is the most economical (wirtschaftliche), taking into account all relevant factors; hence, there is no duty to accept the lowest offer price. There is, accordingly, ample opportunity for discrimination in favor of domestic suppliers and contractors.

Both the VOL and the VOB regulate explicitly the utilization of products or materials of foreign origin but they do not contain any specific provision dealing with the treatment to be given to foreign bidders.

Section 10, No. 4, of the VOL contains the following discriminatory provision (unofficial translation from German):

"4. Specified places of origin or supply sources shall be prescribed only in a case where required because of important reasons. Foreign products may not be supplied if appropriate products are manufactured in the interior of the country at reasonable prices."

Section 9, No. 7, of the VOB provides that (unofficial translation from German):

"The use of materials or construction components of foreign origin must not be requested if appropriate national products exist on the same terms and conditions."

Section 8, No. 1, of the VOB provides that (unofficial translation from German):

"In case of public invitation for offers, the contract documents must be sent to all domestic applicants who undertake professionally to effect performance of the class for which tenders have been invited."

All the foregoing provisions are, however, temporarily suspended. On May 20, 1954, the Federal Finance Minister issued a Circular (Ministerialblatt des Bundesministers für Wirtschaft, No. 12, June 30, 1954) initially providing for their suspension in the following terms (unofficial translation from German):

"In trade exchanges with the country of origin, the principle of reciprocity must be granted in the case of public invitations for tenders, i.e., offers by foreign competitors and of foreign products will, in the evaluation of bids, be considered in application of the same handicaps which the country of

origin concerned will apply to West German bidders."

Moreover, for contracts valued at more than DM50,000 (\$12,500), which involved the designation of a foreigner as the contractor or the use of products of foreign origin, the authorization of the Federal Minister of Finance was required.

The 1954 Circular was superseded by a Circular of the Federal Minister for Economic Patrimony dated April 29, 1960, and still in effect, which, at least literally, placed foreign competitors and products on the same level with domestic competitors and products. An unofficial translation from German of the 1960 Circular is attached hereto. It should be noted that paragraph 3 of the Circular states that application of the principle of reciprocity will again be taken into consideration if difficulties should arise.

The 1960 Circular does not affect provisions for the award of contracts to the following privileged groups:

(a) Expelled people and refugees from the Soviet Zone of Germany, individuals and firms in areas classified as "distressed areas" (including West Berlin), evacuees and victims of National Socialist persecution.

(b) Suitably qualified German "medium-sized" firms (i.e., employing not more than 50 persons). The Ministry of Defense places a proportion of the total value of its contracts with such firms. The proportion varies according to the type of supplies required but in practice ranges between 30 and 40 percent.

In the case of the first mentioned group, the contract is to be placed with the privileged applicant provided he is otherwise qualified and his bid is as economical as (or even, subject to adequate budgetary funds being available, slightly above) the most economical bid submitted by a non-privileged applicant. The *Länder* and municipalities are required to apply the same preferences.

It will be noted that the provisions relating to privileged groups bear considerable resemblance to the provisions of Executive Order No. 10582 under the Federal Buy American Act relating to awards to small business concerns and to concerns located in economically distressed areas.

By virtue of agreements with the United States a great deal of German defense procurement is carried out in the United States, primarily to offset the cost of maintaining United States armed forces in the German Federal Republic.

PRINCIPAL SOURCES

(1) Airgram No. A-737 dated October 31, 1963, entitled "Orders Placed by the German Bundespost with 'Privileged Bidders'".

(2) Letters dated January 31, 1964, and October 15, 1964, from the United States Embassy in Bonn to Cravath, Swaine & Moore, Paris.

(3) de Grand Ry, "L'Harmonisation des Legislations au sein du Marché Commun en Matière de Marchés Publics" [The Harmonization of Laws concerning Public Contracts in the Common Market], *Revue du Marché Commun* (No. 37) pp. 247-251, (No. 38) pp. 282-292 (1961).

(4) Hainaut and Joliet, "Les Contrats de Travaux et de Fournitures de l'Administration dans le Marché Commun" [Public Works and Supply Contracts in the Common Market], vol. 2 (Brussels, 1963).

(5) Marketing Conditions: Germany—III, Business International, February 5, 1965.

GERMAN FEDERAL REPUBLIC

(Joint Ministerial Circular dated April 29, 1960 (Ministerialblatt of the Federal Minister for Economy, No. 11, 1960, page 269)

(Unofficial translation from German)

Bonn, April 29, 1960.

The Federal Minister for Economic Property of the Federation: Ref.: III gen.—0 6060—2/60.

The Federal Minister for Economy: Ref.: IB 9—4436/60.

Foreign Office: Ref.: 400—80.10 (21).

To:

(a) The Federal Minister.
(b) The Federal Minister for Atomic Energy and Water Administration.

(c) The Federal Minister of the Interior.

(d) The Federal Minister for Post and Telecommunications.

(e) The Federal Minister for Transportation—with a copy to the Central Administration of the German Federal Railroads.

(f) The Federal Minister for Defense.

For information to: (g) The Federal Minister for Housing Construction.

Subject: Procurement Matters: Consideration of Foreign Bidders and Foreign Products (VOL/A § 10, No. 4, second sentence; VOB/A § 8, No. 1, first sentence, § 9, No. 7).

Reference:—

Enclosures: One.

The rules provided for in the Regulations (VOL/A § 10, No. 4, second sentence; VOB/A § 8, No. 1, first sentence; § 9, No. 7), concerning:

(a) the consideration of foreign bidders, and

(b) the use of products of foreign origin (where domestic bidders perform services) in the case of public orders must be applied in keeping with the general economic development and, in particular, the progressive integration within the framework of the European Economic Community (EEC); in agreement with the Federal Finance Minister, it is requested that the following principles be observed in connection with all procurements within the Federal territory:

1. In view of the increasing liberalization, especially of the European Market, the German economic situation makes the purchase of foreign products and the consideration of foreign bidders desirable from the viewpoint of commercial and economic policies.

2. The advantages and disadvantages for the domestic employment situation which arise from the use of foreign products or ordering from foreign bidders must not be judged from the viewpoint of the individual economic section directly concerned. In the case of individual sectors of the economy for which special circumstances exist (e.g., mining), a need for protection might be justified from the point of view of national economy; in cases of doubt, it is recommended that an inquiry be addressed to the Federal Minister for Economy (Department I B 9; telephone Bonn 3 01 61).

3. The principle of reciprocity in the case of granting state orders to foreign bidders, as it had been set forth in the circular by the Federal Finance Minister dated May 20, 1954 (II D-O-6060-25/54), shall for the time being not be applicable. If in the future, in certain cases, particular difficulties should arise, the problem of reciprocity will be examined again. The circular of the Federal Finance Minister dated May 20, 1954 (II D-O-6060-25/54) shall in this respect become invalid.

4. When considering offers by foreign bidders, attention is to be given first of all to the following:

(a) the principle for granting orders must be observed (VOL/A § 2, No. 1, VOB/A § 2), i.e., that the bidders are competent, efficient and reliable;

(b) considering all circumstances, the offer must be the most economical ["das wirtschaftlichste"] (VOL/A-§ 24, VOB/A-§ 25), in which connection, particularly in the case of foreign bidders and foreign products, the sufficient securing of warranty rights, supplies of replacement parts and, where applicable, servicing of delivered equipment must, among other things, be carefully weighed.

Since the Federal Republic will, for the time being, no longer apply the principle of reciprocity in the case of public orders (No.

3), offers by foreign bidders shall be evaluated the same as all other offers, although the guiding principles for preferred bidders shall be observed.

5. The principles set forth in Nos. 3 and 4 shall apply *mutatis mutandis* in cases where domestic bidders intend to use foreign products in the execution of the work.

6. The participation of foreign bidders in public bids is promoted by the distribution abroad of the Federal Gazette publishing invitations to bid which the Foreign Office has originated. In connection with the nomination of suitable foreign bidders for limited invitations for offers and direct orders, to which special attention should be paid, it is recommended that inquiries be addressed to the representatives of foreign industrial organizations in the Federal Republic of Germany (see enclosure) or to the Consular offices.

The Economic Ministers (Economic Senators) and Finance Ministers (Finance Senators) of the States ["Länder"] as well as the municipal central organizations have today been informed correspondingly.

The Federal Minister for Economic Property of the Federation:

By order:

ROSSIG.

The Federal Minister for Economy:

By order:

Dr. LANGER.

Foreign Office:

By order:

Dr. HARKORT.

Attested

[OFFICIAL SEAL]

HOWALD.

(Howald)

Enclosure: to the joint circular from the Federal Minister for Economic Property of the Federation, the Federal Minister for Economy and the Foreign Office dated April 29, 1960 concerning: Defense Matters: Consideration of Foreign Bidders and Foreign Products (VOL/A § 10 No. 4 second sentence; VOB/A § 8 No. 1 first sentence, § 9 No. 7)

German-Belgian-Luxembourg Chamber of Commerce: (22c) Köln Cäcilienstr. 46.

United States Chamber of Commerce (16) Frankfurt (M) Rossmarkt 12.

Italian Chamber of Commerce for Germany (16) Frankfurt (M) Feldbergstr. 24.

Netherlands Chamber of Commerce for Germany (16) Frankfurt (M) Forsthausstr. 111.

French Commercial Service in Germany (22 c) Bad Godesberg Kappellenstr. 1 a.

Federation of British Industries (22 c) Köln—Marienburg Goltsteinstr. 219.

The Austrian Commercial Delegate in the Federal Republic of Germany (16) Frankfurt (M) Friedensstr. 5.

ITALY

(Member of EEC, GATT, and OECD)

The public works and public supply contracts of the State are governed by the provisions of Royal Decree No. 2440 of November 18, 1923, making new provisions regarding the administration of Government funds and the general accounting for Government services, as implemented and regulated by Royal Decree No. 827 of May 23, 1924, approving the rules for administration of Government funds and the general accounting for Government services.

Articles 3, 4, and 6 of the 1923 decree provide for the following four methods for the letting of contracts:

(1) Public tender (*asta pubblica*)—public invitations for tenders are issued to an unlimited number of bidders by notices in the press, and, in the case of larger contracts, in the *Gazzetta Ufficiale* (Official Gazette) of the Republic.

(2) Selective tender (*liticazione privata*)—private invitations to tender are issued to a

limited number of suppliers or contractors selected by the contracting authority.

(3) Competitive tender (appalto-concorso)—this method is essentially the same as selective tender but is used in special cases.

(4) Private contract (trattativa privata)—the contract is let after private negotiation with one or more selected suppliers or contractors.

The 1923 decree prescribes public tendering by means of advertising as the normal method. Under the provisions of the 1924 decree selective tendering may be adopted in specified cases, including cases of urgency. Competitive tendering is essentially the same, except that it is used only for special works or supplies requiring well established technical, artistic or scientific qualifications. Under the provisions of the 1924 decree the private contract method may be used in specified cases where special or exceptional circumstances prevail which do not conveniently permit the use of any of the other procedures.

Under the public tendering and selective tendering procedures, the contract is awarded to the bidder who offers the best terms (i.e., the lowest tender in price). The contracting authority does not have discretion to select the bid which appears to it to be the best or the most advantageous. Nevertheless, the contracting authority has the power to exclude any bidder, despite the regularity of the documents which he presents. The exclusion may not be appealed and no reason need be given therefor.

The bidding procedures described above are mandatory for the entire State administration, that is, not only for the Ministries and their subordinate departments, but also for the autonomous agencies and other governmental agencies. They are also mandatory on the local administration level but different rules obtain in the Regions. They are not, however, applicable to industrial enterprises owned by the State, which operate like private corporations.

The only express statutory provision discriminating in favor of Italian firms and Italian materials are contained in Law No. 429 of July 7, 1907, as amended, relating to the State Railways, Articles 33 and 34 of which provide as follows (unofficial translation from Italian):

"33. Supplies of fixed and moveable material and metal structures are, as a rule, contracted out to national industry, by the system of public bidding.

"The general management of the State Railways, upon appropriate resolution of the Board of Directors, may proceed by selective tendering or private contract, when the interest of the Administration so advises or for the purpose of assuring an equitable distribution of the equipment among similar establishments in the various parts of the Kingdom, the provisions of Art. 16 of the Law of July 8, 1904, No. 351, remaining in effect.

"If the result of the public bidding, selective tendering or private negotiations demonstrate that the conditions of national industry do not permit the obtaining of satisfactory prices, the general management of the State Railways, upon due deliberation of the Board of Directors, and following authorization of the Council of Ministers, may proceed with international tenders, to which national firms are also invited.

"The director general shall give a detailed accounting of the above-mentioned supplies in the annual report pursuant to Article 9.

"34. Under the same conditions, national industry must be preferred in international tenders.

"For supplying of materials pursuant to the preceding article, there will be granted by deliberation of the Board of Directors an adequate protection to national industry, which, however, may never exceed 5% of the

offer of foreign industry, increased by the expenses of customs and transport to the place of delivery.

"By offer of foreign industry is meant the average of the lowest offers which represent one-half of the number of foreign offers deemed valid. If these are in odd numbers, one-half is arrived at by the number itself increased by one.

"If the foreign offer consists of only one, the determination of equality of conditions will be submitted to the judgment of the Board of Directors.

"Whenever it may be necessary to provide promptly for the normal supply of materials for the operation of the State Railways, there may be specially authorized, upon resolution of the Council of Ministers, selective tendering or private negotiations with foreign firms.

In the case of public works, bids by foreign firms are effectively precluded by the fact that all contractors who perform works pertaining to the State or to public entities in general in an amount exceeding 10,000,000 lire (about \$16,600) shall be registered in the national list of contractors established by Law No. 57 of February 10, 1962 (Gazzetta Ufficiale, March 2, 1962). Articles 13-15 of such Law, copies of an unofficial translation from Italian which are attached hereto, contain detailed prerequisites for inscription on the list. Most important, Article 13, read in conjunction with Article 15, requires, with respect to private firms, partnerships and corporations that the technical manager and all legally responsible directors be Italian nationals, or if they are foreigners, residents of Italy and nationals of countries which grant the same privilege to Italian citizens on a reciprocal basis. Exceptionally, Article 4 of the 1962 Law provides that, when the works described required a very particular skill and no suitable contractor appears to exist among those registered on the list, the contract may be awarded to Italian contractors not registered on the list or even to foreign contractors, subject to prior notice setting forth the reasons therefor being given by the contracting authority to the Committee in charge of the List.

Nevertheless, the basic form of discrimination against foreign bidders is administrative in nature. Despite the fact that the basic laws and regulations prescribed public tendering as the standard and normal method of letting contracts, the contracting authorities have so interpreted the law and regulations as to relegate public tendering to second place in favor of selective tendering, with the result that that method is used in an estimated 70 to 80 percent of the cases.

In selective tendering the contracting authorities resort to companies included on lists of suppliers, the most important of which is that maintained by the Provveditorato Generale dello Stato (General State Purchasing Office).

In order to obtain registration on the List of that Office, an application must be submitted and the applicant's technical and commercial ability must be established. Other lists of suppliers, more or less governed by the same practice, are maintained by various autonomous and state agencies and by the three branches of the Ministry of Defense (Army, Navy, and Air Force). Other ministries and government offices normally use the first mentioned list. It is extremely difficult, although not impossible, for a foreign company to obtain inclusion on any particular list, unless it operates in Italy through its own organization or a permanent representative. Each agency maintaining a list has full and complete discretion, moreover, as to whether it will or will not inscribe a company on the list, even if it complies with all the requirements prescribed. The same discretion exists in the case of removal from a list.

Furthermore, a number of important agencies are expressly authorized to let contracts by private negotiations. Article 1 of Royal Decree No. 540 of March 11, 1923, prescribes that method as the normal one for the General State Purchasing Office, which purchases certain supplies for all central and local administrations, except the State Railways. Under the provisions of Article 1 of Royal Decree-Law No. 1718 of September 30, 1929, the Ministry of Defense (Air Force) has complete discretion in most cases to use either the selective tendering or private contract methods. Also, Article 31 of Royal Decree No. 728 of June 28, 1912, grants the State Railways complete discretion to use the private contract method. Numerous other agencies have similar statutory dispensation.

PRINCIPAL SOURCES

(1) Letter and memorandum dated May 4, 1964, from Avv. Nicola Troilo of Studio dell'Avv. Ercole Graziadei, attorneys of Rome, Italy, to Cravath, Swaine & Moore, Paris.

(2) Foreign Service Despatch No. 922 dated March 25, 1960, from the United States Embassy in Rome, entitled "EXPORT—Italian Procurement Regulations and Practices as they affect American Bidders and Suppliers".

(3) Airgram No. A-1241 dated March 5, 1963, from the United States Embassy in Rome, entitled "Foreign Government Procurement Practices".

(4) Letter dated December 6, 1963, from the United States Embassy in Rome to Cravath, Swaine & Moore, Paris.

(5) de Grand Ry, "L'Harmonisation des Legislation au sein du Marché Commun en Matière de Marchés Publics" [The Harmonization of Laws concerning Public Contracts in the Common Market], Revue du Marché Commun (No. 37) pp. 247-251, (No. 38) pp. 282-292 (1961).

(6) Hainaut and Joliet, "Les Contrats de Travaux et de Fournitures de l'Administration dans le Marché Commun" [Public Works and Supply Contracts in the Common Market], volume 1 (Brussels, 1962), volume 2 (1963).

ITALY

(Excerpts from law of February 10, 1962, concerning the institution of a national registry of contractors (Gazzetta Ufficiale, Mar. 2, 1962))

(Unofficial translation from Italian)

ARTICLE 13. GENERAL REQUIREMENTS FOR REGISTRATION

The general requirements and necessary certifications for registration in the Registry are:

(1) Italian citizenship, or residence in Italy with respect to foreigners, contractors or directors of legally constituted commercial companies, provided they belong to States which grant reciprocal treatment with respect to Italian citizens.

(2) absence of penal records or pending matters relating to crimes under No. 2 of article 21.

If the technical manager (direttore) of the undertaking is a different person from its owner, the requirements of Nos. 1 and 2 must apply to both;

(3) certificate of registration with the Chamber of Commerce, Industry and Agriculture with indication of the specific activity of the firm;

(4) certificate of direct taxes of the district office from which income under category B is realized, for which the applicant has been registered in the income tax rolls in the 3-year period preceding the registration application, with respect to the particular activity as a contractor developed by him. If the latter is not yet registered, he must produce an appropriate statement by such office;

(5) certificate (optional) of registration in a similar association.

ARTICLE 14. SPECIFIC REQUIREMENTS FOR REGISTRATION

(1) Technical qualification—Technical qualification is demonstrated by means of diplomas, certificates issued or confirmed by technical officials in service activities referring to work executed or directed by the applicant and by any other document.

The certificates under the preceding paragraph must specifically indicate the works executed or directed, their amount, the time and place of execution and state if they were carried out properly and successfully or whether there were disputes with the Administration by arbitration or judicially, with an indication of the results of the same.

If the works were executed on behalf of the State or public entities, the certificate is issued by an official in active service, with qualifications no less than those of the Chief Engineer of Civil Engineering or by an office director, under the immediate direction of whom or under the supervision of the office, of which the official himself is chief, the works were executed.

If the works were executed on behalf of private parties, the relative declaration to be issued by the contractor or, if there was one, by the director of the works, must be confirmed, subject to verification, by the Chief Engineer of Civil Engineering.

For works executed or directed abroad, there may be submitted certificates by the proper consul, which contain all data required above, with the explicit declaration that, before issuing them, the official by whom the documents are signed carried out accurate investigations and obtained information from the technical authorities of the location.

(2) Financial capacity—This is demonstrated by proper bank references or by documents which validly prove the economic and financial potential of the interested party.

Bank references are requested directly and reservedly by the competent Committee of the institutions indicated by the applicant in the registration of the request in question. The other documents must be of a date not earlier than one month from the date of the application for registration and, if of an earlier date, must be expressly confirmed under date no earlier than 1 month from that of the application.

(3) Technical equipment—The possession of technical equipment must appear in the declaration of the applicant, in which there must be listed and described means of operation, equipment, and materials in general at its disposal, reserving to the Administration facilities to execute controls and to provide for legal redress in case of false or inaccurate statements.

Whenever the owner of the undertaking is someone other than the technical manager, the documents under No. 1 must refer to the manager, those under Nos. 2 and 3 must refer to the owner.

ARTICLE 15. REQUIREMENTS FOR COMMERCIAL COMPANIES AND COOPERATIVES

For the registration of commercial companies, cooperatives and their branches:

(a) The requirements under Nos. 1 and 2 of article 13 are applicable: to the technical manager and all "components" if it is an unlimited partnership; to the technical manager and all partners, if it is a limited partnership; to the technical manager and the directors (amministratori) furnished with powers of representation, for every other type of company.

(b) The documents under No. 1 of article 14 are applicable to the technical manager.

The companies must also exhibit an authentic copy of their certificate of incorporation and a certificate of the court issued not more than two months prior to the applica-

tion for registration, from which it may be ascertained that the company is not in a state of liquidation or bankruptcy and has not submitted an application for bankruptcy. It must also be ascertainable from the certificate whether bankruptcy proceedings or an application for bankruptcy have occurred within the 5-year period prior to the above date.

GREECE

(Associate member of EEC; member of GATT and OECD)

Under the provisions of Law No. 3215 of April 26, 1955, Greek industrial products are accorded preference in purchases (through public bidding or otherwise) by State or quasi-governmental agencies, municipalities and communities as well as private business organizations enjoying partial or total duty-free import privileges. An unofficial translation from Greek prepared by the U.S. Embassy in Athens is attached hereto as schedule A.

The preferences are applied as follows:

(a) The margin of preference for Greek products is 8 percent of the landed cost of foreign products (i.e., c.i.f. invoice price plus all duties and taxes, other than turnover tax, payable upon importation). The maximum allowable margin of preference, calculated on the c.i.f. price of a similar foreign product, is 30 percent for domestic products in general and 35 percent for the products of the domestic iron and steel and metalworking industries. In determining the landed cost of imported products, the amount of import duty and taxes added as above to the c.i.f. invoice value may not be higher than 30 percent ad valorem generally and 35 percent ad valorem for metal products, exemption being granted for any duties and taxes in excess of those percentages.

(b) In lieu of the foregoing preferential treatment, Greek enterprises may apply for the duty and tax-free importation of the raw and auxiliary materials required for the production of the goods being procured, in which case the margin of preference accorded the domestic industry is 10 percent (instead of 30 percent or 35 percent) of the c.i.f. price of the foreign product.

(c) In comparing the prices of Greek provincial industrial and handicraft products with those of imported products, the price differentials in favor of Greek products indicated in paragraphs (a) and (b) above, are further increased by the margins of preference accorded provincial products in relation to products manufactured in the capital area, under the provision of Decree Law 2176 of 1952. The margin of preference accorded provincial products over those of the Athens area varies, according to the type of product involved from 2 percent to 5 percent and may in no case exceed 8 percent. By virtue of Law No. 3213 of 1955 those percentages are further increased by 50 percent for industrial enterprises operating on Greek islands (except the island of Euboea). Accordingly, provincial industrial and handicraft enterprises may be given a price preference of 11 percent to 20 percent of the landed cost of foreign products, depending on the location of the producing plant and the type of product involved.

The provisions of Law No. 3215 are not applicable to procurement contracts pertaining to industrial projects authorized under Greece's basic foreign investment law (Law No. 2687 of 1953) and under Law No. 4171 of 1961. For such projects, equipment and supplies may be purchased freely from any source at the discretion of the investor.

THE AGREEMENT OF ASSOCIATION WITH THE EUROPEAN ECONOMIC COMMUNITY

The Agreement was signed on July 9, 1961, and took effect on November 1, 1962 (Journal Official of the European Communities, February 18, 1963). It provides for the associ-

ation of Greece with the Community under the provisions of Article 238 of the Treaty of Rome on the basis of a customs union, with the prospect of full membership when the progress of the Greek economy allows Greece to assume fully the obligations imposed by the Treaty. The customs union is to become fully effective on November 1, 1974, except in the case of specified manufactured goods produced in Greece as to which the effective date will be November 1, 1984.

Article 3 of the Agreement provides for an institutional structure for its implementation. The Association Council, which is composed of representatives of Greece on the one hand and of the Member States and of the Community on the other hand, has the general function of taking all measures necessary to assure the realization of the aims of the Agreement and to conduct all examinations into the development of the cooperation between the Contracting Parties. All decisions adopted by the Council must be unanimous.

The Agreement in general follows the outline of the Treaty of Rome. In the field of public contracts the most important provisions are Article 5 relating to the elimination of discrimination on the basis of nationality, Articles 47 and 48 relating to establishment, Article 49 relating to services, Article 57 dealing vaguely with the approximation of laws and Protocols 1 and 9 limiting the application of the Agreement in the field of public contracts. A copy of an unofficial translation from French of those Articles and Protocols is attached hereto as Schedule B.

It seems obvious that the application of the provisions of the Agreement, as limited by the Protocols, is not likely to have much effect in the foreseeable future in the field of public contracts. Protocol 1 contains express limitations on the application of Article 5 of the Agreement insofar as public contracts are concerned; Protocol 9 contains an exception with regard to agreements for financial aid between the United States and Greece and exempts them, at least until the end of the first transitional period ending in 1974, from the application of the provisions of Article 5. Moreover, Articles 47 and 48 contain only vague provisions with regard to the right of establishment and leave the ultimate decisions in this field to be worked out by the Association Council. Also, under Article 49 the authority to regulate the furnishing of services between the Community and Greece is reserved to the Association Council.

PRINCIPAL SOURCES

(1) Industrial Development Corporation S.A. (Athens), "Greece: Basic Incentives to Industrial Development and Foreign Investment" (July 1963).

(2) United States Department of Commerce, "Basic Data on the Economy of Greece," Overseas Business Reports, No. OBR 64-20 (February 1964).

(3) United States Department of Commerce, "Establishing a Business in Greece," Overseas Business Reports, OBR No. 62-10 (November 1962).

SCHEDULE A. GREECE

(Law No. 3215 of 1955 providing preferences for domestic industrial and handicraft products (Official Gazette, Apr. 30, 1955))

(Unofficial translation from Greek by U.S. Embassy in Athens)

PAUL, KING OF THE HELLENES

Having unanimously voted with Parliament, we decide and ordain:

Article 1

1. In connection with procurements effected by the State, or by Municipalities, or Communities, or any other legal entity of public or private law enjoying total or partial

exemption from import duties, either through competitive tender or otherwise, directly or through the State Procurement Service or any Committee, the products of domestic industry and handicraft are given preference as against the products of foreign origin even if the cost of the domestic products in question is higher up to 8 percent than that of the respective foreign products.

2. Procurements of domestic fertilizers are excepted, as coming under the application of law 760 of 1948 "re marketing of fertilizers" and as long as the law in question is valid.

3. Power production enterprises operating by virtue of contract privileges ratified by specific law, are excepted as well.

Article 2

To determine the comparative cost of a foreign product, we add to the offered CIF price the corresponding import duty—basic and additional—which is provided for each time by the duty tariff, as well as any other tax or due levied on importation, excepting the business turnover tax, which is not reckoned on the cost of the respective home product, and then we add the 8-percent rate provided for in the previous article to the price resulting in this way.

Article 3

1. A 30-percent rate on the respective CIF price of the foreign product is fixed as a maximum of the preference provided for in article 1 hereof in respect of home industry and handicraft products.

2. The maximum rate provided for in the previous paragraph is increased to 35 percent in respect of home metal industry products.

3. As places of delivery for such comparison of prices, according to the above, are determined: (a) the Customs House for the imported foreign products, and (b) the supplier's factory warehouse for the local products.

Article 4

1. At the request of a local industry or handicraft, in lieu of the protection provided for in articles 2 and 3 hereof, exemption from import duty is granted by joint decision of the Ministers of Finance and Industry in respect of the raw and auxiliary material required for the manufacturing of the products offered, in which instance the home product preference rate is fixed at 10 percent on the CIF price of the respective foreign items.

2. The terms and formalities for duty free importation of the raw and auxiliary material dealt with in the previous paragraph, as well as for control over the disposal of these for whatever purpose they have been imported, will be determined by joint decisions of the Ministers of Finance and Industry to be promulgated in the Government Gazette.

Article 5

In respect of monopoly items, as well as of industrial products, on which no direct or indirect duty is levied according to the duty tariff operating each time, the preference rate for the respective home industry and handicraft products is fixed either at 10 percent on the CIF cost of the foreign product, with duty free importation of the raw and auxiliary material required for the manufacturing of such home products, or up to 30 percent without duty free importation of the material in question. The above 10-percent preference rate can fluctuate between 10 and 20 percent in respect of certain monopoly items, following decision of the Ministerial Council.

Article 6

1. The terms of the procurements provided for in article 1 hereof are compulsorily formulated in such a way as to correspond to the possibilities of the local industrial or handicraft production under the prerequisite

that the relative products can meet the requirements for which they are intended.

2. The method of application in general of the previous paragraph will be specified each time by joint decisions of the Ministers of Finance and Industry to be promulgated in the Official Gazette.

3. After 3 months from effect hereof, the procurements provided for in article 1 of the present law shall be effected in accordance with the decisions provided for in the previous paragraph.

Article 7

1. In connection with procurements effected according to the provisions hereof, eventual preference for items of foreign origin as against the respective local ones, entails an obligation for payment of the relevant duties and other taxes whose total cannot, however, exceed 30 percent on the CIF cost of these, or 35 percent as regards iron or metal industry products. In respect of duties and taxes over this percentage, exemption is granted in accordance with the relevant provisions, paragraph 3 of article 2 of E.L. 896/37 having no effect in this connection.

2. Particularly as regards Municipalities and Communities, full exemption from duties and taxes can be granted—following decision of the Ministerial Council issued upon proposal of the Ministers of Finance and Industry—in respect of water pipes imported from abroad, as long as the price of those offered by the local industry exceeds the preference rate of the CIF cost of the former.

3. The previous paragraphs are applicable on procurements of State items as well.

Article 8

The preference rates in favor of local industry products which were determined by virtue of the relative R.D. of the 2nd September 1952 in application of the provisions of article 3 of L.D. 2176/52 re protective measures for provincial industry, as well as by virtue of para. 1 of article 2 of the Law "re amendment and supplementation of the provisions concerning protective measures for provincial industry", are valid collectively in every instance of application of the provisions of the present Law.

Article 9

The contribution on every kind of wax materials, either foreign or local, which is levied in favor of T.A.K.E. (Greek Clergy Insurance Fund) by virtue of E.L. 816/1937, as subsequently amended and supplemented by E.L. 2293/1940, Law 1017/1949 and E.L. 3092/1954, is hereby abolished, as long as the materials in question are utilized—in the opinion of a Committee to be set up by joint decision of the Ministers of Industry and Education—for industrial or handicraft purposes, except for the manufacturing of candles or tapers.

Article 10

Transgression of the provisions hereof constitutes a disciplinary offense, while any civil, municipal or communal servants, or any municipal or communal authorities, or any of the administrative councils or the competent officials of the other entities provided for in article 1, who would eventually approve, or suggest for approval, the minuta of an adjudicated competition, or otherwise carry out a procurement in transgression of the above provisions, shall receive a disciplinary punishment by the competent agents, irrespective of any other legal consequence of such transgression.

Article 11

The following provisions are abolished: (a) article 6 of Law 2948/1922 re promoting industry and handicraft, (b) article 2 of Law 4536/1930 re amendment and supplementation of Law 2948/22, the Decrees issued in application of this article (1) of 14-5-31 re extending the preference limit for

all kinds of stamps, (2) of 23-3-32 re extending the preference limit for military cartridges and ammunition from 20 to 30 percent, (3) of 25-10-35 re extending the preference limit up to 27 percent in respect of machinery and iron construction in general made by the Greek industry, (c) of article 8 para. 4 of E.L. 254/36 re amendment of the emergency laws of 19-10-35 and 28-12-35 re organization of a cotton institute, (d) of joint decision No. 6825/1263/22-1-37 of the Ministers of Finance and National Economy re fixing the preference limit for local cotton industry products at 35 percent, issued in application of para. 4 of article 8 of E.L. 254/36, and (e) of E.L. 477/37 re supplementation of article 16 of Law 2948/22 re promoting industry and handicraft, as amended by article 2 of Law 4536/30.

Article 12

Acts Nos. 261/3-3-1951 and 628/21-5-51 of the Ministerial Council are hereby ratified for the period they have operated, and are abolished by the present. Act No. 602/7-6-52 of the Ministerial Council is likewise abolished.

The acts in question read as follows:

[Note: Translation of Acts No. 261 and 628 of 1951 and Act No. 602 of 1952 omitted]

The present Law, having been passed by Parliament and ratified by Us today, shall be promulgated in the Official Gazette, and enforced as a Law of the State.

ATHENS, April 26, 1955.

PAUL R.

The Ministers of Industry:

A. PROTOPAPADAKIS.

Finance:

L. EFTAXIAS.

Ratified and sealed Athens, April 29, 1955.

The Minister of Justice:

CL. THEOPHANOPOULOS.

SCHEDULE B. GREECE

(Excerpts from agreement establishing an association between the European Economic Community and Greece and attached documents¹)

Article 5

1. In the area of implementation of the Agreement, and without prejudice of any special provisions which it contains, none of the Contracting Parties shall exercise or tolerate discriminations by reason of nationality or against physical persons who are nationals of another Contracting Party established in the territory of one of them.

2. For the implementation of the preceding paragraph, companies constituted pursuant to legislation of a Member State of the Community or of Greece which have their corporate business seat, their central administration or their principal establishment in the territory of one of the Contracting Parties shall be given equal standing with physical persons.

By companies, companies of the civil or commercial law shall be understood, including cooperatives, and other juridical persons under public or private law, with the exception of non-profit companies.

3. The Association Council shall, insofar as necessary, make the appropriate decisions for putting an end to the discriminations referred to in this article.

TITLE III. CIRCULATION OF PERSONS AND SERVICES

Article 47

The Contracting Parties shall facilitate, in a progressive and balanced manner, the establishment of nationals of the Member States in the territory of Greece and of

¹ Unofficial translation from French. The Agreement was executed in Dutch, French, German, Greek and Italian, each of which is equally authentic (Article 77). There is no official English translation.

nationals of Greece within the Community, in accordance with the principles of articles 52 to 56, inclusive, and 58 of the Treaty establishing the Community, with the exception of the provisions and articles relating to time-limits and to the procedure for the realization of a liberalization of establishment.

Article 48

The Association Council shall by decree set the tempo for this realization and establish the terms of implementation concerning the provisions of the preceding article for the different categories of activities; progressive implementation shall take place after the corresponding directives provided for in articles 52 to 56, inclusive, of the Treaty establishing the Community have become effective and in consideration of the special economic and social situation of Greece.

Article 49

The Association Council shall decide, during the transition period provided for in article 6 of the Agreement [1962-1974], on appropriate provisions to be taken in order to facilitate the rendering of services between the Community and Greece.

TITLE IV. PROVISIONS RELATING TO COMPETITION, TAXATION AND GRADUAL ELIMINATION OF DIFFERENCES BETWEEN LEGISLATION

Article 57

In the areas not covered by the provisions of this Agreement which have a direct influence on the functioning of the Association or in the areas covered by these provisions where they do not contain any specified procedure, the Association Council may make recommendations to the Contracting Parties inviting the latter to take measures which will serve to harmonize legislative, regulatory or administrative provisions.

PROTOCOL NO. 1—CONCERNING PUBLIC CONTRACTS

The contracting parties have agreed on the following provisions:

In deviation from the provisions of the Association Agreement, and in particular article 5, the Contracting Parties shall progressively adjust the terms and conditions for participation in contracts awarded by the administrations or public enterprises as well as private enterprises to which special or exclusive rights have been granted, in such a manner that, by the end of the transition period provided for in article 15 of the Agreement [1984], all discrimination between nationals of the Member States of the Community and those of Greece established within the territory of the Contracting Parties will be eliminated.

The terms and tempo under which the adaptation provided for in this Protocol must be realized shall be fixed by the Association Council taking its inspiration from the solutions which may be adopted in this field by the Member States of the Community.

This Protocol shall be attached to the Association Agreement.

PROTOCOL NO. 9—CONCERNING UTILIZATION OF AMERICAN AID BY GREECE

The contracting parties, in an endeavor not to interfere with the utilization of American aid by Greece, have agreed on the following provisions:

1. If the provisions of the Association Agreement form an obstacle to utilization by Greece of special assistance funds placed at the disposal of the Greek economy, either directly by the Government of the United States of America, or by intermediary of an organization designated by it, Greece shall have the power, after notification to the Association Council:

(a) To establish tariff quotas in observation of article 21, paragraph 2, of the Agreement for the importation of merchandise originating in the United States the pur-

chase of which is financed with the funds in question;

(b) To import duty-free merchandise which forms the substance of the gifts provided for by Title III of "Public Law 480";

(c) To restrict awards of contracts to suppliers of products originating in the United States only where the utilization of the funds in question involves the importation of merchandise originating in the United States and where a competitive bidding procedure is required under legislative provisions either of Greece or the United States.

2. At the end of the transition period provided for in article 6 of the Agreement [1974], the Association Council may decide whether the provisions of this Protocol should be abolished or amended.

In the meantime, if changes occur in the nature of the funds referred to in paragraph 1 of this Protocol or in the procedures for utilization, or if difficulties arise with respect to such utilization, the Association Council shall re-examine the situation with a view to taking appropriate measures.

This Protocol shall be annexed to the Association Agreement.

TURKEY

(Associate member of EEC; member of GATT and OECD)

The basic law concerning public procurement is Law No. 2490 of June 2, 1934 (Official Gazette, June 10, 1934), as subsequently amended. Under the provisions of that Law, sealed public tenders are the standard and, in practice, the usual procedure. Procurement authorities may resort to open public tenders or to direct negotiation only when an invitation for sealed public tenders has met with no response, the volume of the goods and services is small or the articles in question are available only from a single source.

The objective of the sealed-envelope bidding system was to eliminate bargaining and price cutting by requiring every bidder to state his lowest price at the outset of the adjudication. In practice, however, there is much bargaining after the bids are opened, since all of them must then be reviewed privately by the Adjudication Commission, which subsequently invites each bidder separately to explain or amplify his offer.

Foreign firms or individuals may tender in the same way as Turkish nationals, unless the contract is for less than LT15,000 (about \$1,667). In that event foreign nationals may not tender unless they are registered with the Turkish Commercial Registry Office and have been established in Turkey for at least 10 years.

In principle no preferential treatment is given to tender from any one foreign country as compared to any other country, except in the case of "tied" external financing arrangements. Under the provisions of Decree No. 6/3083 dated June 1, 1964, however, the Ministry of Finance is authorized to designate the country from which imports of capital goods exceeding \$50,000 are to be made by departments, organizations and establishments in the State sector. The procurement authorities concerned are required to obtain information concerning foreign financing possibilities from the Ministry of Finance prior to their decision to purchase, or award of contracts for, imports exceeding \$50,000. The Ministry may require that the terms and conditions of available credits be taken into consideration by the procurement authority concerned before a contract award is made.

Preference for Turkish products is provided by the requirement that, if the Ministry of Industry determines that a product is manufactured in Turkey in sufficient amounts to meet local demands, no similar product can be imported. On July 28, 1964, the Minister of Industry announced that a

new list of products manufactured in Turkey was being compiled with a view to issuing new regulations precluding the importation of all such products.

AGREEMENT OF ASSOCIATION WITH THE EUROPEAN ECONOMIC COMMUNITY

The Agreement between Turkey and the European Economic Community was signed in Ankara on September 12, 1963, and entered into force on December 1, 1964 (Journal Officiel of the European Communities, December 29, 1964).

The Agreement provides for the association of Turkey with the Community under the provisions of Article 238 of the Treaty of Rome on the basis of a customs union, with the long-term possibility of full membership of Turkey in the Community.

The Agreement provides for a preparatory, a transitional and a final stage in the association. During the preparatory period of 5 years, possibly extended to 9 years, from the effective date, Turkey will continue its efforts to reorganize its economy and for that purpose the Community granted certain concessions in the form of tariff quotas for imports of particular importance to the Turkish economy as well as the granting through the European Investment Bank of financial assistance.

The Agreement provides only a general outline of the arrangements for the transitional stage, the details of which will be settled only towards the end of the preparatory stage. During the transitional stage, which may not exceed 12 years from the effective date, the Contracting Parties will gradually institute a customs union and bring into alignment the economic policies of Turkey and the Community.

The final stage is based on the customs union, which will cover all commodity trade except products of the European Coal and Steel Community.

Article 23 of the Agreement provides for an institutional structure for its implementation similar to that provided by the Agreement of Association with Greece. The Association Council, which is composed of representatives of Turkey on the one hand and of the Member States and of the Community on the other hand, has the general function of taking all measures necessary to assure the realization of the aims of the Agreement and to conduct all examinations into the development of the cooperation between the Contracting Parties. All decisions adopted by the Council must be unanimous.

The Agreement in general follows the outline of the Treaty of Rome. Unlike the Agreement of Association with Greece, there is no specific provision with regard to the elimination of discrimination on the basis of nationality in the field of public contracts. Articles 8 and 9, however, contain the following general provisions with regard to the elimination of discrimination on the basis of nationality during the transitional stage (unofficial translation from French by the American Society of International Law, 3 International Legal Materials 65 (1964)):

"Article 8

"In order to realize the objectives set forth in Article 4, the Association Council shall establish, prior to the start of the transitional phase, and in accordance with the procedure provided in Article 1 of the Provisional Protocol, the conditions, terms and rate of application of the provisions pertaining to the fields covered by the Treaty establishing the Community which will have to be considered, specifically those covered by the present Title, as well as any safeguard clause which might be considered useful.

"Article 9

"The Contracting Parties acknowledge that within the field of application of the Convention, and without prejudice to the specific provisions which might be established

by virtue of Article 8, any discrimination on account of nationality is prohibited in accordance with the principle set forth in Article 7 of the Treaty establishing the Community."

Vague provisions relating to the right of establishment and the free rendering of services are contained in Articles 13 and 14, which provide as follows:

"Article 13

"The Contracting Parties agree to take inspiration from Articles 52 through 56 and 58 of the Treaty establishing the Community in order to eliminate the restrictions on the freedom of establishment among them.

"Article 14

"The Contracting Parties agree to take inspiration from Articles 55, 56, and 58 through 65 of the Treaty establishing the Community in order to abolish the restrictions on the free performance of services among them."

Similarly, vague provisions relating to the approximation of legislation are contained in Article 16, which provides as follows:

"Article 16

"The Contracting Parties recognize that the principles set forth in the provisions relating to competition, fiscality, and the approximation of legislation, contained in title I of the third part of the Treaty establishing the [sic] Community, must be made applicable in their Association relations."

It seems obvious that the application of the provisions of the Agreement is not likely to have much effect in the foreseeable future in the field of public contracts.

PRINCIPAL SOURCES

(1) Union of Chambers of Commerce, Industry and Commodity Exchanges of Turkey, "Investment Guide to Turkey" (Ankara, 1964).

(2) United States Department of Commerce, "Investment in Turkey: Basic Information for United States Businessmen" (1956).

(3) United States Department of Commerce, "Selling in Turkey," Overseas Business Reports, OBR No. 64-97 (September 1964).

EXCISE TAX ON TELEPHONE SERVICE

Mr. KREBS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. VIVIAN] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. VIVIAN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to bring to the attention of the Members of the House of Representatives a petition I recently received from some 400 good citizens of the Lambertville, Ottawa Lake, and Temperance areas in the Second Congressional District of Michigan. The petition urges Congress to remove the Federal excise tax on telephone service.

This is an outstanding example of citizens being personally and individually interested in national legislation, and wisely acting to inform their representatives in Washington of their opinions. The merits of the reduction or abolition of the excise tax on telephone service deserves careful attention.

Few would argue today that telephone service is a luxury; certainly the productivity of my own office would be considerably diminished without our telephones.

I have received a number of letters from elderly people in Lambertville and Temperance reminding me that they live alone and must maintain their telephone service, but that the tax on this service is a heavy load on their severely limited incomes. Most of us will agree that the telephone is no luxury for these people. Is it, in fact, a luxury for any of us?

Is the telephone a luxury for the businessman who orders, sells, and generally conducts a great deal of his business on the phone? Is it a luxury for the professional man; the housewife; the public administrator?

Of course, Mr. Speaker, the answer to these questions is: No. The telephone is a necessity in 20th century America, and everyone in this body knows it. My petition has come from citizens of the Second District of Michigan, but I believe they speak for millions of American telephone users.

As we all know, most excise taxes now in force were enacted in order to discourage "consumer" spending at a time when national resources and production were needed for a war effort. Today, we promote consumer spending in an effort to maintain our booming peacetime economy. Is it wise to maintain a tax which operates in opposition to national economic policy? I think not.

And, I would add, it is particularly inappropriate to continue a tax, falling on an essential service, which taxes without regard to a family's ability to pay. In this country, we have established the graduated income tax as that tax most likely to fall upon the citizen with some relation to his ability, as judged by his income, to pay. We have tried to reserve excise taxes largely to the function of "user taxes." This is how we justify, for example, gasoline taxes: they force the user of motor vehicle fuel to pay his share of the cost of constructing and maintaining highways.

But surely there is no cost to the Federal Government in the private use of telephone service. And the impact, for the average family in any given tax bracket, falls most heavily, as a percentage of income, on those low-income families least able to pay.

When legislation to adjust the Federal excise tax reaches this floor for a vote during this session of Congress, I hope we will abolish the fiction of the "luxury" telephone and remove this tax from the statute books.

NEW YORK CITY IN CRISIS— PART LIV

Mr. KREBS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following articles from the March 11, 1965, edition of the New York Herald Tribune.

These articles concern New York City's participation in the poverty program and is part of the series on "New York City in Crisis."

The articles follow:

NEW YORK: CITY IN CRISIS—CITY POVERTY PLEA
TODAY: \$11 MILLION
(By Barry Gottehrer)

An anticipated request by Mayor Wagner for more than \$11 million in additional anti-poverty funds from the Federal Government is expected to trigger at least two moves to audit the books of and investigate Haryou-Act, the controversial Harlem community-action program. Haryou-Act, which has been beset by internal conflict and external criticism since its formation last June, has been the target of increasing attacks and rumors during the last 2 months.

The audit reportedly would come from Sargent Shriver's Office of Economic Opportunity, which Mayor Wagner will ask today to give \$1.5 million of the requested \$11 million to Haryou-Act.

Though the audit is expected to be described as "customary procedure" when it takes place in the next 10 days, it is understood that the Federal agency has been waiting for its first opportunity to see exactly what has been taking place behind the doors of the Harlem organization, which now occupies two floors of the Hotel Theresa at 125th Street and 7th Avenue.

Though more than \$5 million in city and Federal funds have already been appropriated for Haryou-Act, today's request represents the first time any funds have been requested directly from Sargent Shriver's office.

The second investigation will be called for by Representative ADAM CLAYTON POWELL, whose 18th Congressional District includes Haryou-Act's headquarters and whose reported influence and control of the program has been the chief source of much of the organization's continuing difficulties.

It was also learned last night that the city's antipoverty operations board, which has had only praise for the program publicly, has been privately conducting its own intensive audit of Haryou-Act's books for nearly a month.

Though Anne Roberts, the \$22,500-a-year staff director of the city board, maintained last night that the city audit was "standard practice whenever city funds are used," Livingston Wingate, executive director of Haryou-Act, said that the audit has been brought about by "outside criticism" and "all those rumors."

Mr. Wingate, a onetime assistant to Representative POWELL, said he was referring to rumors centering around Haryou's decision to rent new quarters in the Theresa Hotel early this year.

Haryou-Act, which has been negotiating a lease with the owner of the Posner Building on 128th Street and still hopes to move there, had moved into the Theresa in early February to accommodate its expanding program and staff of 150.

Rumors of an inflated rental and a possible real estate coup, according to Mr. Wingate, reached city hall and precipitated the audit.

"Screwane (city council president and anti-poverty board head) called us down and has been having his auditor go over our books for nearly a month," Mr. Wingate said yesterday.

Though he says the audit is still going on, Mr. Wingate says the city now agrees that Haryou-Act got "quite a deal" in renting the space at the hotel.

Under the contract rental according to Mr. Wingate, Haryou-Act is paying less than \$14,000 in rent for 6 months and has induced owner Philip Edwards to pay \$10,000 to repair and renovate the two floors, a section of the lobby, and a private elevator.

According to a contract signed and dated February 16, however, Haryou-Act agreed to pay the landlord \$3,312.50 a month—a total of \$19,875 for the 6 months.

Reached at his downtown office last week, Mr. Edwards said he was "gambling"—that he was hoping that Haryou-Act would stay longer than the 6 months.

Mr. Wingate said yesterday, however, that Haryou-Act had already made it clear to Mr. Edwards that it could not possibly extend its contract.

Mr. Wingate, 49, who earns \$25,000 a year as director of the Nation's largest and most controversial antipoverty project, says he is also aware of the other possible investigations of the program.

"I have been hearing about plans to audit our books and investigate Haryou-Act for weeks," he said yesterday. "I welcome the investigation. If there is anything wrong here, I'd like to know about it. No project in the Nation has done as much as we have in so short a time. Any investigation that will give us a fair and honest appraisal will be most welcome."

Mr. Wingate heartily disagreed with the criticism that he had packed Haryou-Act with friends and associates of Representative POWELL.

This criticism has existed since early last year, when Dr. Kenneth Clark, acting chairman of Haryou whose perceptive study, "Youth in the Ghetto," helped to launch the Harlem program, resigned from the group, which was to be merged with Act.

His charge: Representative POWELL was trying to control the entire program.

These charges flared anew last month when Kenneth Marshall, Haryou-Act's program director, was ousted.

Mr. Marshall and his attorney, Paul Zuber, charged that the entire organization had become Representative POWELL's private project and brought their charges to the attention of at least one New York Representative and a Middle Atlantic Senator.

"A congressional investigation is completely warranted," said Mr. Zuber last night. "This becomes mandatory when it is considered that the area served by Haryou-Act is a high-tension area and a potential danger area during the summer if there are no facilities and programs available for youngsters in the community."

Although Mr. Wingate—and the city administration—say that the Haryou-Act program has made "tremendous strides," considering that the first funds were not received until last September, others in addition to Mr. Zuber and Mr. Marshall have serious doubts.

One member of a group of New York City and State businessmen told several city officials after a tour of the Haryou-Act headquarters last fall that "as a matter of fact, if we were running the city, probably the first thing we would do would be to run a good hard audit on Haryou-Act."

The majority of these visiting businessmen saw little evidence of progress and achievement in the program, which had been designed to upgrade the skills and psychological attitudes of the area's 71,000 youths.

When the program was first conceived, Haryou-Act was described as an attempt to reduce the awesome delinquency and school dropout rate and at the same time combat the general hopelessness and despair of central Harlem's 232,000 residents.

It is precisely this conflict—between the city's claims and the mounting criticism—that reportedly has brought about the call for audits and investigations.

Though he says he is "satisfied" with the Haryou-Act progress and describes the program as the best in the United States, Representative POWELL said yesterday that as chairman of the House Education and Labor

Committee, which must pass on antipoverty funds, he still plans to call for an investigation of Haryou-Act and antipoverty programs all over the country.

"This investigation is the first order of business," he said. "Since the program began in my committee I think it's my responsibility to check and see how it's functioning."

Mr. Wingate said yesterday that the program had been somewhat slow in getting started but only because funds had been slow in being released. He said that, as of yesterday, only one-third of the appropriated funds had been utilized.

It was also learned last night that Mayor Wagner's plea for new Federal funds today will also request the setting up of six community project centers to combine all antipoverty services under one roof in various areas of the city.

These program centers, which reportedly will consume the large share of the \$11 million, will resemble the Haryou-Act and mobilization-for-youth programs where all of an area's antipoverty programs are consolidated.

These six centers are reportedly scheduled for south Jamaica, Brownsville, east Harlem, Bedford-Stuyvesant, south Bronx, and lower Manhattan.

Criticism of the city's program and its delay in making its Federal request occurred at a luncheon of the Federation of Protestant Welfare Agencies yesterday afternoon.

Lester Granger, former president of the International Conference of Social Work, said, "We haven't got a war on poverty. We have a government pronouncement of an objective. Whether or not we have a real war on poverty is going to depend on this man (gesturing at Mayor Wagner) and you guys and gals."

After the luncheon, Mayor Wagner told reporters that Mr. Granger, "an old friend"—had "made a broad statement."

"We have a lot of programs," said the mayor, who then conceded that there had been "a great deal of delay due to bureaucracy." "We are really just at the beginning," he added. "I think we're ahead of anywhere else in the country."

NEW YORK CITY IN CRISIS—FOR THE CITY'S WAR ON POVERTY, A \$500-A-WEEK CONSULTANT

(By Martin J. Steadman)

The city's antipoverty program has a \$500-a-week consultant.

She is Mrs. Mary Conway Kohler, one of three consultants hired by the Poverty Operations Board.

The others are Mrs. D'Jarls Watson, wife of Civil Court Judge James Watson, and Sidney Shiff. Mrs. Watson earns \$65 a day and Mr. Shiff is paid \$60 a day as a consultant on small business problems.

Mrs. Anne Roberts, \$22,500-a-year director of the antipoverty program, said the three consultants were "ital, vigorous, social workers," who have been very helpful to her administration.

Mrs. Kohler also is a \$75-a-day consultant to the U.S. Labor Department, and to the National Institute of Mental Health. In addition, she is paid \$250 a day by two private foundations as a consultant.

She said yesterday that she keeps a diary and only charges a day's pay to the agency or foundation she worked for that day.

"Listen, this is none of your business," she said. "Sure, I make a lot of money. But I'm not going to tell a newspaperman how much I earn from my private business. The \$100 a day I receive from the poverty program is really one of my cheapest fees."

Though Controller Abraham D. Beame's office has Mrs. Kohler listed as "\$500-a-week consultant" to the Poverty Operations Board, and a spokesman for the controller

said she was paid "fairly regularly" since May 1964, Mrs. Kohler said she sometimes works only half-time and can only recall charging the city full-time during December and January, when she helped set up the Neighborhood Youth Corps Program.

The total amount paid to Mrs. Kohler could not be learned late yesterday. She said she wouldn't tell if she knew.

She also refused to identify the two private foundations, and refused to say how much she is paid as a consultant to the National Institute of Mental Health. She did say that she probably only worked a few days for that agency last year.

Mrs. Roberts, the director, said Mrs. Kohler was "a tremendous consultant, with a respected background in social work."

Mrs. Kohler is paid at a higher rate of daily pay than the director, Mrs. Roberts.

Mrs. Kohler, who is now 60, came to New York from San Francisco in 1952. She had been a referee in San Francisco's Juvenile Court for 15 years. On her arrival here, she became a consultant to family and children's courts.

She is a member or trustee of 15 voluntary service organizations, and on November 2, 1963, Mayor Wagner appointed her to a vacancy on the board of education.

At the time of her appointment, Mrs. Kohler said she had devoted her entire life to "the disadvantaged children. I never thought of doing anything else."

Five months later, Mrs. Kohler resigned from the board of education to accept the poverty program job. In an interview shortly after taking her new job, Mrs. Kohler told a reporter:

"I decided early in life that I wanted to do some sort of public service work either as a social worker or a lawyer, and I chose the latter. I was born in Oakland, Calif., but went to convent schools all over the country and in Europe. My upbringing in the convents taught me always to serve and be responsible for the poor."

Mr. Shiff and Mrs. Watson could not be reached at the Poverty Operations Board offices at 250 Broadway yesterday afternoon. Mr. Shiff was at a meeting in Harlem and Mrs. Watson was in the field. Mrs. Watson is a trained social worker.

Judge Watson was until last year a Harlem political power, serving in the State senate. Her name was recently mentioned as a possible candidate for Manhattan borough president to succeed Edward R. Dudley, who became a supreme court justice January 1. Though Mrs. Constance Baker Motley won the post, it was said Judge Watson was the first choice of Tammany Hall leader J. Raymond Jones.

The Poverty Operations Board was formally announced June 30, 1964, by Mayor Wagner in an executive order. The mayor said his new antipoverty agency would "facilitate, expedite and energize the prosecution of 'The War Against Poverty.'"

NEW YORK CITY IN CRISIS— PART IV

Mr. KREBS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the following article is the second on New York City's participation in the war on poverty. It appeared in the New York Herald Tribune on March 12, 1965.

The article is part of the series on "New York City in Crisis," and follows:

NEW YORK CITY IN CRISIS—THE INVESTIGATION OF HARYOU—POWELL WILL LEAD IT

(By Alfonso Narvaez and Barry Gottehrer)

Mayor Wagner called on the Federal Government yesterday to provide the city with more than \$10.3 million to implement the community action phase of New York's war on poverty.

At the same time, reports of an investigation of Haryou-Act, the controversial Harlem project which has been beset by internal conflict and external criticism since its formation last June, were confirmed.

The investigation of Haryou-Act and "poverty programs all over the country" will be conducted by Representative ADAM CLAYTON POWELL, chairman of the House Committee on Education and Labor, whose 18th Congressional District includes Haryou-Act headquarters and whose reported control has been the source of much of the program's problems.

CITY PROGRAM

In Washington, a Federal spokesman said that the Office of Economic Opportunity, which Mayor Wagner asked to give \$1.5 million of the \$10.3 million to Haryou-Act, "might" audit the Harlem project's books.

Though the spokesman said that "no special attention" would be paid to Haryou-Act, it had been learned previously that the Office of Economic Opportunity has been interested in clearing the air of controversy that has surrounded the project. An audit, as reported in yesterday's *Herald Tribune*, is expected to take place in the next 10 days.

In making his announcement at city hall yesterday, the mayor said the city would begin a "multipronged community action program based in six poverty-stricken neighborhoods, aimed at providing work for the disadvantaged, supplying needed new services and coordinating present ones.

"This new undertaking is designed to encourage, equip and help train the poor to help themselves, to make the services of government and voluntary agencies available and accessible to all * * * and encouraging the neighborhood people to participate in shaping the form and content of the anti-poverty programs in their neighborhoods."

The mayor said that under the terms of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, the city would have to provide an additional \$1.1 million, bringing the total cost of the program to \$11.5 million.

The city's request for funds will be reviewed by Sargent Shriver's Office of Economic Opportunity in Washington, but a reply is expected within 30 days. The proposals will then be sent to Governor Rockefeller for final clearance.

Council President Paul R. Screvane, chairman of the city's antipoverty operations board, who took part in the press conference, denied heatedly a report that his office was conducting a special audit of Haryou-Act's books. He said that he did not know if the Federal Government or Representative POWELL was planning to conduct any investigation.

"I've been in constant touch with the people in the Office of Economic Opportunity and I have not heard of any probe," Mr. Screvane said. "I am not conducting one. We called Mr. Wingate (Livingston Wingate, executive director of Haryou-Act) a month ago, and we spoke of program, and went over fiscal matters. Their controller and our fiscal officer have been talking since then but there is nothing unusual about this."

PROGRESS CENTERS

When asked about reports of possible investigations, Mr. Wingate told the *Herald Tribune*, "I welcome the investigation. If there is anything wrong here, I'd like to

know about it. No project in the Nation has done as much as we have in so short a time. It's the only project in the country where the people in the ghetto have diagnosed their own ills, formulated their own program and are implementing it. Any investigation that will give us a fair and honest appraisal will be most welcome."

When the money is finally approved, the city hopes to establish community progress centers in 6 of the 16 major areas of poverty in the city. However, no centers will be established in Harlem or on the Lower East Side, where Haryou-Act and mobilization for youth are already working.

The centers, which the city has requested \$6.4 million to get going, will be established in East Harlem, Manhattan's West Side, Southeast Bronx, South Jamaica in Queens, and in the Williamsburg and Brownsville sections of Brooklyn.

Each center will employ about 25 professionals who will train and eventually employ more than 4,500 nonprofessional youths and adults. Representatives of city agencies will also use the centers to service the local residents.

The nonprofessional youths will serve as social worker aids, laboratory assistants, recreational aids, nurse aids, and orderlies. Adults will get training as school aids, home-maker aids, home visitors, housing aids, and information aids.

Youths working under the program will be paid \$1.25 an hour, while adults will get \$1.50 during their training period and eventually \$1.75 an hour.

The city hopes that these nonprofessionals will learn enough to be able to take jobs in private industry.

The main target of the city's war on poverty will be the 1.7 million residents who live in conditions approaching poverty. The city will direct its efforts toward helping the unemployed adults, preschool children, mentally retarded children, unemployed school dropouts, unwed mothers and the aged.

The city hopes that the establishment of the centers will result in jobs for 4,800 persons, direct assistance to 55,000 others living in the designated poverty areas, and opportunities for participation in the program to the areas' 888,000 persons.

Other items in the city's request call for \$1.5 million for Haryou-Act for the creation of neighborhood boards and neighborhood service centers, \$500,000 for three programs for the Puerto Rican community, and \$1.1 million for educational enrichment programs.

Mayor Wagner said that the funds being requested were for the rest of the calendar year, and that the request next year would be even greater. He said that he hoped to have the program working in 15 poverty areas next year.

LATIN AMERICA—THE WAGE BACKGROUND

Mr. KREBS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GONZALEZ] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, in the past few months I have delivered a number of speeches on the floor of the House in regard to Latin-American relations and the Alliance for Progress. I have been attempting to bring to the attention of my colleagues some of the accomplishments of the Alliance, its potential for bringing about reform and development

in Latin America, and the hard work that needs to be done.

Encouraging as are the steps that have been taken through the Alliance—the housing units, schools, and roads that have been built, the tax reforms that have been initiated—the problems that remain are enormous. Anyone who has a familiarity with the stark poverty of the Latin American masses, contrasting sharply with the wealth of the ruling families, is struck not only by the injustice of those conditions, but also by the difficulty in conveying or explaining them properly to others.

The American Institute for Free Labor Development in its April 1965 report published a compilation of data on the average monthly earnings in selected worker categories in the Latin American countries. The worker categories covered are textiles, mining, construction, and white collar. Earnings are given in the dollar equivalents.

Anyone interested in our own hemisphere should glance over this list, which I will insert in the RECORD at the close of my remarks. Some of the wages, particularly those in Venezuela, seem fair enough. Wages in that country range from \$100 per month in the textile industry to \$300 per month for white collar workers. But the workers in the other countries, in the categories selected, do not do so well.

Think what it means to earn \$21.02 per month as a mineworker or \$23.28 per month as a construction worker in Paraguay. How does one feed his family, much less house and clothe it, if he earns only \$25.62 per month as a textile worker in Brazil, or \$37.26 per month in the same industry in Chile, or \$40 per month as a mineworker in El Salvador, or \$25 per month as a construction worker in Bolivia? The answer, in many cases, is that you do not, adequately—that your children get sick and die.

While reading this list of average monthly earnings, one should keep in mind that only four categories are portrayed. In many other areas, such as agriculture, the wages are even lower. Further, there are millions of Latin Americans who are not even within the money economy. That is, they grow only enough food to subsist, make their own clothes, and barter for what necessities they can.

This is part of the meaning of economic underdevelopment.

With unanimous consent I am inserting in the RECORD the compilation of statistics, "1964 Wage Background—Latin America," from the AIFLD report, April 1965:

THE 1964 WAGE BACKGROUND—LATIN AMERICA

The following data was compiled by the AIFLD social projects department from information furnished by United States and Latin American official sources and, most especially, reliable Ibero-American trade union representatives. The table below shows average monthly income ranges. In some instances where minimum and maximum ranges were not available or where the extent of disparity was negligible, the only available figure or deducible average is given. In other cases for which figures were either unavailable or deemed unreliable, the designation "NA" has been used.

It should likewise be noted that the wages cited are based on official currency exchange rates. They, therefore, reflect disparities caused by unrealistic rates for some currencies. Inasmuch as no attempt whatever has been made to correlate this data with the

purchasing power of individual national currencies, the figures themselves cannot be regarded as a reliable measure of the standard of living. They are presented solely as factual information within the body of reservations indicated above.

Average monthly dollar equivalent earnings in selected worker categories

| Country | Textiles | Mining | Construction | White collar |
|---------------------|---------------|-----------------|---------------|---------------|
| Argentina | 94.00 | (1) | \$65.33 | \$86.00 |
| Bolivia | 50.00-67.00 | 40.00-70.00 | 25.00-41.00 | 40.00-100.00 |
| Brazil | 25.62 | 37.50 | 26.25 | (1) |
| Chile | 37.26 | 46.58 | 33.22-86.41 | 51.55-120.80 |
| Colombia | 60.34-69.62 | \$73.10-149.11 | 49.46-80.58 | 58.92-181.86 |
| Costa Rica | 52.50-67.50 | 75.00-100.00 | 75.00-137.50 | (1) |
| Dominican Republic | (1) | 50.00-150.00 | 57.50-190.00 | 190.00 |
| Ecuador | 53.00-68.14 | (1) | 19.47-113.57 | 216.33 |
| El Salvador | 65.00 | 40.00 | 60.00 | 80.00 |
| Guatemala | 40.00-70.00 | (1) | 30.00-50.00 | 250.00 |
| Honduras | 62.50 | 57.50 | 70.00 | 72.50 |
| Jamaica | 83.99-189.00 | 148.76-324.00 | 89.78-218.81 | 324.00 |
| Mexico | 72.00-91.20 | 56.00-80.00 | 68.80-72.00 | 64.00-88.00 |
| Nicaragua | 64.28 | 58.91 | 82.85 | 100.00 |
| Panama | (1) | (1) | 64.00-120.00 | 100.00 |
| Paraguay | (1) | (1) | 23.28 | (1) |
| Peru | 87.87 | 63.02 | 66.57 | 38.77 |
| Trinidad and Tobago | 47.20-94.40 | \$99.12-112.34 | 59.47-75.52 | 47.20-70.80 |
| Uruguay | 48.00-75.00 | (1) | 105.00-122.00 | 107.00-185.00 |
| Venezuela | 100.00-135.00 | \$170.00-220.00 | 135.00-190.00 | 240.00-300.00 |

¹ Not available.

² Minimum.

³ Does not include allowance for married workers of additional \$9.33 for spouse and per each child.

⁴ Includes petroleum workers.

⁵ Does include 15 percent for fringe benefits received.

THE BRACERO PROGRAM IS OVER

Mr. KREBS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GONZALEZ] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, that the bracero program is finally over no one can now seriously doubt. The following article in the April 1965 issue of the Laborer reviews briefly the news conference held by the Secretary of Labor, W. Willard Wirtz, in Los Angeles, after his 4 days of field visits and inspections of farm labor areas. In the course of the 1,200 miles that Secretary Wirtz covered in his inspection tour he saw for himself the backwardness and the substandard working conditions to which farm laborers are subjected.

Secretary Wirtz concluded not only that Congress was correct in ending the bracero program and ending the guaranteed labor supply that the Federal Government had been providing to the large growers, but he also concluded that the working conditions must and will be improved—there must be as a minimum improvement, decent housing and better wages for the farm workers.

I was particularly interested to note in the Secretary's remarks that he has endorsed a Federal minimum wage for agricultural employees. My bill, H.R. 2422, extends Federal minimum wage coverage to farm workers. The need for such a law has been dramatically demonstrated by Secretary Wirtz' recent inspection tour.

With unanimous consent I am inserting in the RECORD a copy of the article "Wirtz Predicts More Unionization of Farm Workers," from the April 1965 issue of the Laborer.

WIRTZ PREDICTS MORE UNIONIZATION OF FARM WORKERS

"The bracero program is over." With this terse statement at a news conference in Los Angeles, Calif., Secretary of Labor W. Willard Wirtz spelled out conclusions reached following 4 days of field visits and inspections of the California farm labor areas from Sacramento in the north down to the Mexican border. He was accompanied by Under Secretary of Labor John Henning, on the trip.

Following his 4 days of visits the Secretary held an informal press conference at the Los Angeles airport at which he spelled out his general reactions and conclusions to what he had seen and heard during the 1,200-mile trip.

Three main factors in the California labor situation were cited by the Secretary who has been under pressure to recommend admitting thousands of braceros or Mexican temporary laborers to help harvest the vegetable and fruit crops of the Far West. The Secretary noted:

Congress in ending Public Law 78 admitting braceros has "changed a situation in which there had previously been a fully insured, guaranteed labor supply for California agriculture. That will no longer be the case."

Another change is the fact "that this previously guaranteed and assured labor supply had been provided under terms which included no competitive or bargaining power as between employer and employee—the employment was solely on terms and conditions which could be dictated, subject only to the application of laws by the employers."

On this point the Secretary said that "From here on there will be a competitive factor in the labor situation which there has not been before."

A marked change in character of workers will be made. Under the old law at least one-fifth of California agriculture labor was performed on the basis of single individuals living apart from their families.

In the future, Mr. Wirtz said, "it is clear that to the extent that this labor is performed by workers from the United States, it will mean to a considerable extent workers who travel with their families."

Throughout the press conference the Secretary noted the importance of decent housing (he blasted some of the horrible housing conditions observed) and the necessity of providing decent wages and living conditions. He punctured the myth that decent wages would mean skyrocketing prices. While admitting that there would be some increase, he said that studies showed that field labor costs were in the order of a "part of a cent" a unit (a can of tomatoes, a head of lettuce, a dozen oranges, a pound of asparagus, etc.).

He also foresaw an "increased amount of unionization" with U.S. workers used as against braceros. He also said he and Henning personally favored a national minimum wage law for farmworkers. He said he felt that there would be an adequate supply of domestic workers and he concluded by saying " * * * there have been grossly unfair suggestions that the domestic workers involved here are an inferior breed compared to the rest of us."

THE 40TH ANNIVERSARY OF CORAL GABLES, FLA.

Mr. KREBS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. FASCELL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, the travel section of the New York Sunday Times reads throughout the long, cold, Yankee winter as though it were a Florida publication. Story after story relates the history, the attractions, and the beauties of different Florida cities, towns, beaches, race tracks, museums, colleges, and, of course, occasionally a photograph of a Florida bathing beauty is included because of our prospective northern visitors' well-known cultural and intellectual interests.

For example, the issue of the Sunday Times for January 31, 1965, contained a long and interesting article about Florida's Gold Coast, with a detailed map of the area that extends from Hollywood to South Miami. But all that was said of Coral Gables was that it contained a "Miracle Mile" and the palm-lined campus of the University of Miami. There is much, much more to be said than that about Coral Gables, and its 40th anniversary as a city is an appropriate time to say it.

On April 29, 1925, Coral Gables was incorporated by the Legislature of the State of Florida as a city in its own right. Ever since then, no city in America has been able to excel Coral Gables in its boundless opportunities for everyday, winter-and-summer outdoor sports, enjoyment, and pleasure.

George Merrick was the moving spirit behind the development of Coral Gables. By about 1922, he began to obtain the financial support that was needed for the city of his dreams. He permitted nothing to be built on his land that did not conform to high architectural standards. He managed to interest leading American architects, town planners, and engineers in the infant Coral Gables, and they worked together in long committee meetings and endless conferences.

In the rise in land values that took place, Mr. Merrick found the basis for the financial support that he needed for his great project. An additional purchase of land extended his territory until it included 10,000 acres in all, or approximately 16 square miles. The Coral Gables Corp. came into being; boulevards were constructed; canals and waterways and lakes were blasted with dynamite and cleared by ditching machines; winding avenues with courts and fountains and plazas were cut out of the solid coral rock; hotels and public buildings began to rise out of what had been, only a few years before, George Merrick's father's 160-acre grapefruit grove.

Two hundred miles of paved streets were built, along with schools and banks and shops. In 2 years from the founding of the city, no less than fifteen hundred private homes were passed by the architectural board. At the time when the Florida land boom reached its height, Coral Gables was only about a fourth completed, sufficiently far advanced to give an indication of Mr. Merrick's conception of what the perfect city should be. The prevailing architecture was Spanish. Its main boulevards were all 100 feet wide, and at their intersections were fountains surrounded by tropical trees and wide plazas paved with coral rock. Everywhere was foliage of brilliant hues.

The streets were not laid out in the usual rectangular pattern, but, in many instances, were made to run parallel to the waterways. The houses were built to stand well back in their gardens. Then, as now, there were dazzling colors, white walls, striped awnings, red roofs, brilliant greenery, and always the intense blue of the Florida sky.

Taken as a whole, the building of Coral Gables was a magnificent achievement, in many ways far in advance of its time. Its water and lighting, its drainage and public utilities generally, embodied the best in scientific thought and engineering.

Coral Gables has survived boom-and-bust, it has survived hurricanes, it has survived to become the thrilling and beautiful spot it is today. The Gables is a city secure in its wealth and prestige with such outstanding city officials as, Mayor C. L. Dressel, Jr., Commissioner William H. Chapman, Commissioner Joseph H. Murphy, Commissioner W. Keith Phillips, Jr., Commissioner George M. Wilson, and City Manager L. W. Robinson, Jr. On its 40th anniversary, my colleagues will join me in a salute to Coral Gables, the city beautiful.

NEW UNDER SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE

Mr. KREBS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PURCELL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. PURCELL. Mr. Speaker, I want to take this opportunity to congratulate the President on his selection of Mr. John A. Schnittker to be the new Under Secretary of Agriculture. He has made an outstanding choice.

It has been my privilege to work very closely with Mr. Schnittker on a number of occasions. I believe this has given me the opportunity to become well acquainted with him, both as a person and in a professional capacity.

As a person, he is always pleasant, courteous, and interested in other people and their problems. To my knowledge, his integrity is unquestioned.

In his professional capacity, I have gained the highest respect for Mr. Schnittker's knowledge of agriculture and the operation of farm programs. He has served most capably in his position as Director of Agricultural Economics, a position which prepared him very well for his new responsibilities. I have been with him in conferences with legislators, farmers, processors, and consumers. He has a deep insight into the desires, needs, and problems of all groups concerned with the vast field of agriculture.

His appointment is another example of President Johnson's desire to give merit promotions to capable and deserving career Government employees. I congratulate the President and Mr. Schnittker on this appointment.

THE 200TH ANNIVERSARY OF CAJUNS ARRIVAL IN LOUISIANA

Mr. KREBS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. WILLIS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Speaker, it is general knowledge that south Louisiana is the center of French culture in the United States. A large percentage of the French-speaking people of Louisiana are Canadian in origin. Having come from an area in Nova Scotia called Acadia, they are referred to as "Cajuns," a corruption of the word "Acadians."

This year we Cajuns are celebrating the 200th anniversary of our ancestors' arrival in Louisiana, and in this regard I insert into the RECORD statements by Dean Thomas Arceneaux, of the University of Southwestern Louisiana, and by the Honorable Roy R. Theriot, Louisiana State Comptroller, which tell of the coming of the Acadians to Louisiana and of the French-Acadian culture which has thrived there:

TWO CENTURIES OF ACADIAN CULTURE IN LOUISIANA

(By Thomas J. Arceneaux, dean, College of Agriculture, University of Southwestern Louisiana, Lafayette, La.)

This year marks the completion of the second century of Acadian culture in Louisiana. It was 200 years ago and 10 years after their cruel exile from their once peaceful valley in far off Nova Scotia, that the first official group of displaced Acadians arrived in Louisiana. There is a tradition that a few

Acadians had come here previous to the beginning of the migration which started two centuries ago, but we do know positively that, beginning in 1765 and continuing for over 20 years thereafter, many groups of displaced Acadians arrived in Louisiana to once again plant the culture of old France in still another part of the New World.

We, of Acadian Louisiana, are proud that we are the descendants of the first French colonists in the New World. Port Royal, in old Acadia, now Nova Scotia, was settled in 1605. That was 2 years before the founding of Jamestown, 15 years before the landing of the Mayflower, and 113 years before New Orleans became the capital of Louisiana. Following their exile from Canada in 1755 and after many years of sufferings as a displaced people, they finally settled the vast fertile and yet undeveloped regions of south Louisiana. Because of their high ideals, their thrift, and their rural French-Acadian culture, they transformed a wilderness into one of the most highly developed rural sections of our Southland. Yes, beautiful is the land with its prairies and forest of fruit trees. They who dwell there have named it the Eden of Louisiana.

Before their exile from Nova Scotia, the Acadians had honestly endeavored to live, for 42 years, as best they could under British rule, only to be deported as criminals. Then it was that they suffered the hardships of long years of exile, and they lived through those horrible years inspired and sustained by the hope that someday their wanderings would lead them to sunny Louisiana where dwell their own race and where waved the flag of "La belle France." Their wanderings did lead them to Louisiana, but to a Louisiana that had become, by that time, a Spanish colony. So once again, fate denied them the privilege of becoming citizens of their mother country. In spirit they remained as French-Acadians as ever, but at the same time they became loyal subjects of his Spanish majesty. Gladly did they accept land grants in the bayou and prairie country, and gladly did they brave the dangers of the wilderness in order to build a solid foundation of civilization and culture.

The loyalty of the Acadians to the country of their adoption is strongly attested by the fact that many among them enthusiastically responded to the call of Governor Galvez, when he led his expeditions to fight for the cause of the American revolutionists. Thus it is that many of the descendants of those brave pioneers are justly proud of their memberships as Sons and Daughters of the American Revolution.

To become citizens of yet a different country, as a result of the Louisiana Purchase, was not a new experience for our ancestors, but to become citizens of the rapidly growing Nation they had helped to establish by their active participation in the Revolution, must have been a welcome challenge to a group who had suffered so much in order to persevere in their high ideals. Their continued contribution to Louisiana and to America is proof of their strong determination to live as decent, law-abiding men of good will. Their faith in America and America's faith in them has been richly rewarded. Today, south Louisiana is one of the most progressive regions of our great Nation.

Today, the Evangeline country has been enriched by the migration, to our midst, of people from all parts of our Nation and from abroad. Together we strive to work in peace and in harmony in the great task of contributing our full share to the continued progress of our section, our State, and our Nation. While we commemorate the completion of two centuries of Acadian culture in Louisiana, we, the descendants of those brave pioneers, together with all the people of our great State, should take this great occasion as a means to thank God for having led our Acadian ancestors to the

"Eden of Louisiana," and eventually to become citizens of the greatest nation of all times. We gladly accept the challenge to remain true to their high ideals; true to the ideals which inspired Longfellow to immortalize their deeds in his great poem, "Evangeline." Thus, it is with justifiable pride that we commemorate two centuries of Acadian contributions to the development of our area, our State, and our Nation.

The rich heritage of the Louisiana Acadians is graphically represented by the flag recently adopted by their cultural society, France-Amerique de la Louisiane Acadienne. To symbolize the French origin of the Acadians, a portion of the arms of their mother country—three fleurs de lis—silver on a blue field—is used as part of the flag. To symbolize Spain, the nation which controlled Louisiana at the time of the Acadian migration to Louisiana and under whom they prospered after years of exile, the old arms of Castille—a gold tower on a red field—appear in one section of the flag. A gold star on a white field represents Our Lady of the Assumption (Maris Stella), Patroness of the Acadians. The star also symbolizes the active participation of the Acadians in the American Revolution, as soldiers under Gálvez.

STATEMENT BY ROY R. THERIOT

The year 1965 marks the completion of two centuries of Acadian culture in Louisiana—200 years have passed since our noble and courageous forebears officially started their migration to Louisiana, a land destined to become a vast reservoir of unexcelled culture.

It is only fitting and apropos that the offspring of these high-principled, scrupulous, and loyal people commemorate the year 1965 with sacred memories of the past, a glorious and proud present, and with a resolute future, for no other people can be prouder of its great heritage than the Acadians of Louisiana.

The activities of our forebears at the moment of their exile in 1755 establishes beyond any question of doubt their principles, their courage, their fortitude, devotion to their church, and to their heritage. As a result, the sacrifices which they made became our dividends, blessings, and our good fortune. Because of this glorious inheritance we should accept it with pride and an unshakable determination to keep it alive forever. Let us, therefore, during this commemorative year of 1965 rededicate ourselves anew with vigor toward the preservation and perpetuation of our great birthright. To reject this plea and to entertain the thought of allowing our great heritage to wilt and die is paramount to denouncing the historic bravery, courage, and sacrifices, of our forebears and would be nothing short than the loudest expression of ingratitude to our fathers, mothers, our grandfathers, our grandmothers, to our great-grandfathers, our great-grandmothers, and to our kinsmen even beyond that.

The Acadians of Louisiana have given to our State and Nation distinguished leaders in all fields among which are lawyers, jurists, doctors, engineers, architects, public servants, teachers, priests and other religious leaders, and some of the finest business people. Certainly with this type of contribution to our State and Nation no person of Acadian descent can have but the greatest of pride.

The hospitality of the Acadians is unsurpassed and unexcelled. Our *joie de vie* and *esprit de corps* have endeared other people to us. The kindness, friendliness, and consideration of the Acadians have brought to us the highest praise.

In view of all of these accomplishments, no Acadian needs to apologize to anyone for his heritage. In fact, every Acadian should be proud of his heritage.

Thank God I am an Acadian—I am proud to be an Acadian, and I want my children to be as proud as I am of our ancestry.

I urge and invite everyone to join with us at the various events during this year commemorating 200 years of Acadian culture.

REGULATION OF SALE AND DISTRIBUTION OF FIREARMS

Mr. KREBS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HANSEN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. HANSEN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I would like to make a few comments and observations regarding legislation that has been introduced into the Congress to regulate the sale and distribution of firearms.

We are all aware of the tragedy of Dallas. The American people will always mourn the loss of their young President at the hands of a demented assassin. However, I do not believe we should be stampeded into passing legislation which would drastically curtail the availability of firearms to the American people. It was the very availability of personal firearms that gave birth to this great Nation. This right is written into our Constitution.

I know that many of us enjoy the occasional use of firearms in target practice, hunting, and other areas. Firearms are necessary to the individual to protect life and home. There is no doubt that some means of control should be established to keep these dangerous weapons out of the hands of juveniles, the mentally incompetent, and similar types of persons. However, I would urge the Congress to be most careful and thoughtful before enacting any legislation that would tend to deny the right to own and bear arms by the American people.

Mr. Speaker, I am hopeful a meaningful bill that will properly regulate the sale and distribution of firearms will come before the Congress for consideration. But, I call on this House not to let emotions or hysteria infringe upon a right of the American people since the beginning of our Republic.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. FASCELL, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. HOSMER (at the request of Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina), for 20 minutes, on May 3; to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. TENZER (at the request of Mr. KREBS), for 30 minutes, on May 6; and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL

RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. MAHON to revise and extend his remarks and include tables on the conference report on H.R. 7091.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. KREBS) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. OTTINGER.

Mr. MINISH.

Mr. CORMAN.

Mr. MONAGAN.

Mr. FASCELL.

Mr. DORN.

Mr. FULTON of Tennessee.

Mr. VANIK.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. KREBS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 34 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, May 3, 1964, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1018. A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the District of Columbia Income and Franchise Tax Act of 1947, as heretofore amended, to provide that taxable income for District income tax purposes and net income for District franchise tax purposes shall conform as closely as possible to taxable income for Federal income tax purposes under the present and future income tax laws of the United States, except as otherwise specifically provided herein, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1019. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report of ineffective interservice utilization of aircraft jet engine parts, Department of Defense; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1020. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report of overpricing of aircraft identification equipment under contract AF 30(635)-13712 with Bell Aerosystems Co., a division of Bell Aerospace Corp., Wheatfield, N.Y., Department of the Air Force; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1021. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report of unnecessary costs incurred in the indirect procurement of selected subsystems and assemblies for A-4 aircraft and other types, Department of the Navy; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1022. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report of unnecessary retention of high-value land for recreation, Reserve forces training, and military housing purposes at Fort DeRussy, Waikiki Beach, Hawaii, Department of the Army; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1023. A letter from the commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice, transmitting reports concerning visa petitions which the Immigration and Naturalization Service has approved according the beneficiaries of such petitions first preference classification under the Immigration and Nationality Act, as amended, and pursuant to section 204(c) of the act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1024. A letter from the Administrator, Veterans' Administration, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 1822 (a) of title 38, United States Code, to extend the provisions for treble-damage actions to direct loan and insured loan cases; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

1025. A letter from the Secretary of the Air Force, transmitting a report of the one Air Force military construction contract awarded by the Department without formal advertising for the period July 1 through December 31, 1964, pursuant to section 605 of Public Law 88-390; to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina: Committee on Armed Services. H.R. 7657. A bill to authorize appropriations during fiscal year 1966 for procurement of aircraft, missiles, and naval vessels, and research, development, test, and evaluation, for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 271). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. FOGARTY: Committee on Appropriations. H.R. 7765. A bill making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 272). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois:

H.R. 7740. A bill to provide Federal assistance to restore and repair certain disaster areas in the State of Illinois; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BENNETT:

H.R. 7741. A bill to amend the Small Business Act to provide for increased eligibility for and greater utilization of the displaced business disaster loan program established under section 7(b)(3) of that act; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia:

H.R. 7742. A bill to amend section 3 of the act for the retirement of public school teachers in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. DENT:

H.R. 7743. A bill to establish a system of loan insurance and a supplementary system of direct loans, to assist students to attend postsecondary business, trade, technical, and other vocational schools; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mrs. GRIFFITHS:

H.R. 7744. A bill to establish a national policy and program with respect to wild predatory mammals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. HANSEN of Iowa:

H.R. 7745. A bill to strengthen intergovernmental relations by improving cooperation and the coordination of federally aided activities between the Federal, State, and local levels of government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. MATSUNAGA:

H.R. 7746. A bill establishing the rate of compensation payable to certain employees

of the United States for performing inspection or quarantine services on a Sunday or holiday; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 7747. A bill to amend title 37 of the United States Code in order to assist career members of the Armed Forces to provide their children with a college education, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 7748. A bill to amend chapter 147 of title 10, United States Code, to authorize the Secretary of Defense, or his designee, to dispose of telephone facilities by negotiated sale; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. MOORE (by request):

H.R. 7749. A bill to nullify certain rules of the Federal Communications Commission relating to the Citizens Radio Service; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MORGAN:

H.R. 7750. A bill to amend further the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MICHEL:

H.R. 7751. A bill to amend the Export Control Act to prohibit actions by domestic concerns furthering restrictive trade practices or boycotts fostered or imposed by foreign countries against other countries friendly to the United States; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 7752. A bill to amend the Federal Firearms Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROBISON:

H.R. 7753. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act to provide for the adjustment of inequities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. SCHMIDHAUSER:

H.R. 7754. A bill to amend certain laws relating to housing in order to assist in the provision of decent, safe, and sanitary housing for low-income families in urban and rural areas, to provide standards for determining just compensation in eminent domain proceedings, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. CELLER:

H.R. 7755. A bill to amend section 633 of title 28, United States Code, prescribing fees of U.S. commissioners; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GONZALEZ:

H.R. 7756. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that a survivor beneficiary shall not lose his or her entitlement to benefits by reason of a marriage or remarriage which occurs after he or she attains age 62; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 7757. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a taxpayer a deduction from gross income for tuition and other expenses paid by him for his education or the education of his spouse or any of his dependents; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FULTON of Tennessee:

H.R. 7758. A bill to designate a proposed park on the shores of the J. Percy Priest Reservoir as the "Estes Kefauver Memorial Park"; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. McDADE:

H.R. 7759. A bill to amend the Agricultural Marketing Agreements Act of 1937 to require hearings on the adequacy of milk marketing order prices under drought conditions; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. NELSEN:

H.R. 7760. A bill to amend the Consolidated Farmers Home Administration Act of 1961 to provide additional assistance for disaster victims; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. COHELAN:

H.R. 7761. A bill to authorize the appropriation of additional funds necessary for ac-

quisition of land at the Point Reyes National Seashore in California; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HEBERT:

H.R. 7762. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, with respect to the Reserve Officers' Training Corps; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. PEPPER:

H.R. 7763. A bill to amend the Employment Act of 1946 to declare a national policy with respect to the right of Americans to employment without regard to sex or age; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. SKUBITZ:

H.R. 7764. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp in honor of Susanna Madora Salter, first woman mayor in the United States; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. FOGARTY:

H.R. 7765. A bill making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and for other purposes.

By Mr. ABBITT:

H.J. Res. 436. Joint resolution to amend section 316 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 to extend the time by which a lease transferring a tobacco acreage allotment may be filed; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. PEPPER:

H.J. Res. 437. Joint resolution to authorize the President to proclaim the week beginning February 10 in each year as National Parkinson Week; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BENNETT:

H. Con. Res. 402. Concurrent resolution regarding the right of self-defense of the parties to the Inter-American Treaty of Reciprocal Assistance in forestalling intervention, domination, control, and colonization by international communism in the New World; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MORSE:

H. Con. Res. 403. Concurrent resolution to express the sense of Congress against the persecution of persons by Soviet Russia because of their religion; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. CAMERON:

H. Con. Res. 404. Concurrent resolution to request the President to initiate discussion of the Baltic States question before the United Nations with a view to gaining the independence of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia from the Soviet Union; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. KEOGH:

H. Res. 359. Resolution to stop the transfer of the Naval Training Devices Center at Sands Point, N.Y., pending an investigation; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. NELSEN:

H. Res. 360. Resolution establishing a Special Committee on the Captive Nations; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

230. By Mr. PEPPER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Florida, to the Congress of the United States to provide for the designation of a highway from Tampa, Fla., to Miami, Fla., as a part of the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways; to the Committee on Public Works.

231. By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Rhode Island, relative to proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States prohibiting literacy tests, so-called, in the States, as

a prerequisite to the exercise of voting rights; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BATES:

H.R. 7766. A bill for the relief of Miss Charicila Dede; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BRADEMAS:

H.R. 7767. A bill for the relief of Dominic Barbaro; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FARBSTEIN:

H.R. 7768. A bill for the relief of Lena S. Tillman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FINO:

H.R. 7769. A bill for the relief of Gerlando Sottile, Giuseppa Sottile and Pasqualina Sottile; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GIAIMO:

H.R. 7770. A bill for the relief of Giuseppe Maturo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HANLEY:

H.R. 7771. A bill for the relief of Timothy Wilson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MCVICKER:

H.R. 7772. A bill for the relief of Kenneth Daniel Chase; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MATSUNAGA:

H.R. 7773. A bill for the relief of (John) Juan N. Ganaden, his wife, Lucia Magusara Ganaden, their minor son, Ernesto Alejandro Magusara Ganaden, and their minor daughters, Lucille Magusara Ganaden, and Georgina Magusara Ganaden; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROGERS of Florida:

H.R. 7774. A bill to provide for conveyance of certain mineral interests of the United States in real property situated in Florida to the record owners of the surface of that property; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. ST GERMAIN:

H.R. 7775. A bill for the relief of Timoteo A. Tuazon; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

194. The SPEAKER presented a petition of Henry Stoner, Columbus, Ohio, relative to requiring the Committee on Government Operations to issue certain charts annually which was referred to the Committee on Government Operations.

SENATE

THURSDAY, APRIL 29, 1965

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, and was called to order by the Acting President pro tempore.

Archbishop Hrant Khachadourian, prelate of the Armenian Apostolic Church of America, New York City, N.Y., offered the following prayer:

Heavenly Father, we thank Thee for Thy most cherished gift, the spirit of freedom. We ask that Thy every blessing be showered upon this Nation, where freedom and human justice proceed triumphant. Reveal always Thy infinite and holy spirit to the several Members of this august body, that they may be inspired toward a greatness of purpose, that they may be ennobled in the great and constant quest for peace, freedom, and justice for all mankind.

In Thy unbounded kindness, remember the souls of the 1½ million Armenians who perished in the Turkish massacres of 1915. Their once blessed land, O Lord, is now but an accursed and barren desert of empty silence. Give us, we beseech Thee, the joy of fulfillment in that land which was sanctified by the blood of our martyrs. We commit our hands and hearts to make of it an altar of glorification of Thy spirit.

Today, in sorrow, and yet in hope, we offer to Thee our bitter sacrifices upon the altar of freedom, in an act of redemption for all mankind. In turn, Heavenly Father, we ask only that Thy other children be always spared the anguish, the terror, and the agony of the final and overwhelming act of human rejection—genocide. We have seen that anguish. We have felt that terror. We have known that agony. We pray that the tyranny of man over men will vanish as the morning mist under the brilliance of Thy shining countenance. Armenians suffered long under the yoke of tyranny; and yet, Almighty Father, they asked little, and wanted nothing but freedom to live in the image of Thy Son, Our Lord, Jesus Christ.

Grant, O God, courage and forbearance to this great Nation, that it may stand steadfast against any future visitation of horror on mankind. Give, we beseech Thee, but a particle of Thy celestial wisdom to all men and nations, that they may learn to walk together on the path of righteousness and freedom. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, April 28, 1965, was dispensed with.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 4) to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as amended, to establish the Federal Water Pollution Control Administration, to provide grants for research and development, to increase grants for construction of municipal sewage treatment works, to authorize the establishment of standards of water quality to aid in prevention, controlling, and abating pollution of interstate waters, and for other purposes, with amendments, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to a concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 349) welcoming to the United States the Inter-American Bar Association during its fourteenth conference to be held in Puerto Rico, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

LIMITATION ON STATEMENTS DURING TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, statements during

the transaction of routine morning business were ordered limited to 3 minutes.

APPOINTMENT BY THE VICE PRESIDENT

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair, on behalf of the Vice President, wishes to announce the appointment of the senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. McNAMARA] to the U.S. National Commission for the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO).

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

LOAN OF CERTAIN SUBMARINES TO FRIENDLY FOREIGN COUNTRIES

A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the loan of naval vessels to friendly foreign countries, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

LOAN OF CERTAIN NAVAL VESSELS TO FRIENDLY FOREIGN COUNTRIES

A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the loan of naval vessels to friendly foreign countries (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

SALE OR LOAN OF NAVAL VESSELS TO FRIENDLY LATIN AMERICAN COUNTRIES

A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the sale or loan of naval vessels to friendly Latin American countries, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT ON MILITARY PROCUREMENT ACTIONS FOR EXPERIMENTAL, DEVELOPMENTAL, OR RESEARCH WORK

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Installations and Logistics), transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on military procurement actions for experimental, developmental, or research work, for the 6-month period ended December 31, 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT ON STRATEGIC AND CRITICAL MATERIALS STOCKPILING PROGRAM

A letter from the Director, Office of Emergency Planning, Executive Office of the President, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the strategic and critical materials stockpiling program, for the 6-month period ended December 31, 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

AMENDMENT OF COMMUNICATIONS ACT OF 1934, TO CONFORM TO THE CONVENTION FOR THE SAFETY OF LIFE AT SEA, LONDON (1960)

A letter from the Chairman, Federal Communications Commission, Washington, D.C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, to conform to the Convention for the Safety of Life at Sea, London (1960) (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Commerce.

PROPOSED LEGISLATION RELATING TO DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

A letter from the Acting President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the act entitled "An act to provide